

INSTITUTIONAL RESISTANCE TO FUTURE CHANGE: ATTITUDES  
OF STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS IN SELECTED POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

By

JOHANNA C. WHITE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1979

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Culmination of this research was personally and professionally supported by many persons. My thanks are offered to James L. Wattenbarger and Harold C. Riker for their patience. Special thanks and appreciation are due Arthur Sandeen for the countless hours reserved from his busy schedule for counsel, motivation, and encouragement. Appreciation is offered to John Nickens for his guidance and statistical knowledge and to Stephen Ritch and Jean Holzer for their invaluable help in programming data. Gratitude is offered to the numerous persons at the University of Florida for their friendship and the valuable hints they offered along the way. Finally, a special acknowledgment is offered to personal friends and relatives, here and elsewhere, who supported my efforts throughout.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Resistance to Change . . . . .	3
Theoretical Background . . . . .	4
Institutional Size . . . . .	5
Institutional Permanency . . . . .	5
Institutional Type . . . . .	5
The Student Affairs Sector of Institutional Administration . . . . .	6
Problem Statement . . . . .	7
Delimitations . . . . .	8
Limitations . . . . .	8
Justification . . . . .	9
Assumptions . . . . .	11
Definition of Terms . . . . .	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	13
Resistance to Change in Education . . . . .	15
Institutional Type . . . . .	17
Institutional Size . . . . .	19
Institutional Permanency . . . . .	20
Historical Development of Student Affairs . . . . .	21
Student Services in Community Colleges . . . . .	25
Trends Affecting Postsecondary Educational Institutions . . . . .	27
Trends Affecting Student Affairs . . . . .	30
Changing Student Profiles . . . . .	30
Financial Constraints . . . . .	36
State and Federal Control . . . . .	41
Demand for Accountability . . . . .	43
The Consumerism Movement . . . . .	46
Summary of Predictions of Contemporary Educational Writers . . . . .	49
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY . . . . .	51
Research Hypotheses . . . . .	51
Research Design . . . . .	52

	Page
Research Instrument . . . . .	53
Reliability of the Instrument . . . . .	54
Validity of the Instrument . . . . .	54
Research Sample . . . . .	56
Data Collection Procedure . . . . .	57
Data Treatment Procedure . . . . .	58
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	59
Institutional and Research Category Data . . . . .	59
Analyses of Instrument Statements Results . . . . .	61
Discussion of Significant Differences by Category . . . . .	88
Resistance to Future Change by All Institutions . . . . .	90
Acceptance of Future Change by All Institutions . . . . .	91
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	92
Research Summary . . . . .	94
Conclusions . . . . .	96
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	98
APPENDIX	
A. INTRODUCTORY LETTER REQUESTING COOPERATION FOR RESEARCH . . . . .	102
B. INSTITUTIONAL ACCEPTANCE/RESISTANCE TO CHANGE SCALE . . . . .	104
C. INSTRUMENT STATEMENTS DETERMINED TO BE UNRELIABLE IN MEASUREMENT OF RESISTANCE TO CHANGE . . . . .	109
REFERENCE NOTES . . . . .	115
REFERENCE LIST . . . . .	116
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH . . . . .	126

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

INSTITUTIONAL RESISTANCE TO FUTURE CHANGE: ATTITUDES  
OF STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS IN SELECTED POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

By

Johanna C. White

June 1979

Chairman: Dr. Arthur Sandeen

Major Department: Educational Administration

The focus of this research was to explore the relationship, if any, of the postsecondary institutional characteristics of type of institution, size of institution, and length of time of institutional existence (permanency) with institutional resistance to future change as perceived by student affairs practitioners. Types of institutions were defined as universities and community colleges. Size of institutions was defined as institutions with a student population of over 20,000 and institutions with a student population of under 7,000. Permanency of institutions was defined as institutions which had been in operation over 50 years and institutions which had been in operation 20 years and under. Eight institutions in the State of Florida with characteristics which met the established criteria were selected for study.

The student affairs sector was selected as the research sphere as the student affairs sector of postsecondary institutions is generally accepted to be an integral part of administration. Student affairs practitioners with some administrative responsibilities in programs

and activities were defined as the research population. The research sample consisted of 71 student affairs practitioners from the eight institutions studied.

Resistance to future change was measured by a researcher developed, Likert scale with five values. Each of 26 statements was a prediction of future change in student affairs made by two or more contemporary educational writers. A split-half correlation, doubled by Spearman-Brown formula to actual length of the instrument, yielded a correlation of .90.

The null hypothesis stated that no difference in institutional resistance to future change in student affairs would be found, as perceived by student affairs practitioners, between types of institutions, size of institutions, or between permanency of institutions. The design selected to test the hypotheses was a 2x2x2 analysis of variance. An analysis was performed on each statement.

Interpretation of the results suggested that no clear difference in resistance to future change was perceived by student affairs practitioners between types of institutions, size of institutions, or permanency of institutions when each characteristic was considered individually. Evidence was found that a relationship may exist when type of institution and size of institution were considered in interaction. Large universities were perceived by student affairs practitioners to be more resistant to future change in student affairs. Utilizing a Student's  $t$  statistic for small samples, new, large universities were perceived to be more resistant than old, large universities at the .05 level of significance.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Throughout the development of postsecondary education in the United States, colleges and universities have not been immune to change. From the nine colonial colleges of the early 1700s, through the rise of professional and coeducational schools, the elective plan initiated at Harvard, the graduate programs inaugurated at Johns Hopkins University, the creation of the land-grant colleges, the institution accreditation process, the establishment of the early junior colleges, and other significant events, postsecondary education and its institutions have changed radically (Brickman, 1972). Although the changes were radical for the times, a sufficient number of years elapsed between changes permitting educational institutions to assimilate the new direction. Since the GI Bill of Rights, and the wartime baby boom following World War Two, and more recently, the Civil Rights Acts, the United States Supreme Court decisions as they related to postsecondary education, and the social ferment of the 1960s, members of educational institutions have had to cope with more rapid change from a variety of sources. Martorana and Kuhns (1975) commented:

For many reasons, the decades of the 1970s and the 1980s seem destined to be marked as particularly innovative in the history of higher education. Critical and fundamental shifts are occurring in American society and in the economy and the colleges and universities will have to cope with their ramifications. (p. 2)

Vaccaro (1975) agreed: "The past 10 to 15 years have witnessed unprecedented change in our colleges and universities. The next . . . 10 years, in my opinion, will usher in even more drastic reform" (p. 389).

Today, prevalent trends, such as increased state and federal control, financial constraints, changing student profiles and values, increased demand for institutional accountability, the student consumerism movement, exponentially expanding knowledge, collective bargaining, alternative educational systems, technological advances, and other trends, may serve to alter the structure, programs, and activities of postsecondary educational institutions in ways not yet clear. Clark Kerr (1973) noted in detail the state of postsecondary institutions today:

Certain forces are pressing in from outside the institutions: (1) the demographic shift in which higher institutions are experiencing a slowdown of growth, (2) the changing labor market for college graduates, (3) the increase in public power and control of higher education, (4) the increasing tendency on the part of the students to demand specific changes and developments, (5) the new electronic technology that is changing forms and modes of communication, (6) the expansion of variety and types of postsecondary educational opportunities, and (7) a reemphasis upon individual and humanistic values. Other pressures are coming from within: (1) students asking for more influence over more parts of the university, (2) the greater fluctuation in student choice of specialization and less flexibility on the part of the faculty, (3) the greater interest on the part of faculty regarding faculty matters, (4) the pressure from women and ethnic minorities for more places in the faculty ranks, (5) the general aging of the faculty, (6) the greater opposition to the general culture from the academics, and (7) the narrowing income differential between the more and less highly educated. (pp. 38-39)

A multitude of contemporary educational writers, reporting these and other trends, have concluded that accelerated change in the field of education appears destined to continue for the foreseeable future. To this end, they have speculated on how such trends, single or in tandem, may alter the future structure, organization, programs, and activities of postsecondary campus life.



### Resistance to Change

If some observers have concluded that there are external forces impelling change in postsecondary institutions, others have noted that there are also forces, internal to the institution, which operate to resist change. Zander (1964, p. 543) defined resistance to change with a concept borrowed from psychotherapy: Behavior which is intended to protect an individual from the effects of real or imagined change. According to Zander, if a person believes a change has been made, or fears potential change, it makes no difference whether the perceived change is true or not; persons will behave as though there has been or will be a change in an attempt to protect themselves from the unknown consequences of change.

The same protective behavior attributed to individuals may also be attributed to members of educational institutions. Griffiths (1969, p. 368) said that educational institutions are structured mechanisms employed by society to achieve one of its goals. Since the goals do not change noticeably and the broad activities of each organization are rather clearly demarcated, a particular organization exists with a "built-in" stability. "This stability is so great as to constitute a powerful resistance to change" (p. 368). Any threat constituting real or imagined change to the stability of an institution may arouse protective behavior in members of the institution. In addition to built-in stability, educators have noted other features found in educational institutions which may play a part in interfering with educational change: bureaucratic organization (Abbott, 1969, p. 44-45), complex levels of hierarchy (Presthus, 1965, chaps. 1 & 2),

conformity to existing norms (Watson, G., 1973, p. 117), and deeper commitments to the status quo than to change (Stiles, 1973, pp. 257-280).

Irving Kristol, co-editor of The Public Interest (1968, p. 50), commenting on the inability of postsecondary institutions to change with the times, stated that "the university has been--with the possible exception of the post office--the least inventive (or even adaptive) of our social institutions since the end of World War Two." However, postsecondary institutions are not identical. Institutional missions, geographical locations, student populations, controlling bodies, organizational structures, and other characteristics differ widely among institutions and may have an influence on resistance, or acceptance of change, by members of the institution.

### Theoretical Background

Theorists such as Robert Presthus, Kurt Lewin, Richard Miller, and others, have proposed three characteristics which differentiate postsecondary institutions and which may have a significant effect on resistance or acceptance of change: (1) members of larger institutions may be more resistant to change than smaller institutions; (2) members of long established institutions may be more resistant to change than recently established institutions; and (3) members of some types of institutions, such as universities, may be more resistant to change than others, such as community colleges. Assumptions and statements proposed by theorists regarding the relationship of resistance to change to institutional size, institutional type, and the length of

time an institution has been in existence (institutional permanency), are treated in more detail in the sections below.

### Institutional Size

Morrish (1976, p. 78) stated that large educational institutions are resistant to change as "institutional mass is an extremely resistant force." Presthus (1965, p. 291) proposed that the larger an institution is, the more the bureaucratic structure it sustains and the more inflexible it becomes in resisting pressures for change. In addition, the larger the organization, the less the capacity to meet demands for change since criticism and innovation tend to be muffled by its demands for conformity (Presthus, 1965, p. 9).

### Institutional Permanency

The longer an institution is in existence the more resistant it becomes to change. According to Lewin (1951, p. 225) historic constancy (institutional permanency) creates an additional force which tends to maintain the present system in addition to whatever other forces are at work to keep the system constant. These forces become equivalent to vested interests in a certain level, becoming more rigid over time (Miller, R., 1967, pp. 5-15).

### Institutional Type

Henderson and Henderson (1974, pp. 28-43) distinguished between institutions by institutional role. According to them, universities offer programs culminating in professional degrees based on a considerable body of formal knowledge and theoretical research. In contrast, Henderson and Henderson described community colleges as a comparatively

recent addition to postsecondary education which offer vocational and adult educational programs along with college parallel work at the freshman and sophomore levels to a part-time, commuter population. Community colleges emphasize teaching and are not inhibited by traditions relating to admissions, curricula, or degree requirements. They are so organized as to treat students with the total development of each student as the primary goal. R. I. Miller (1974) described community colleges as "the most creative and innovative segment of postsecondary education. They are also the newest and, therefore, have suffered less from the ossification found in some four year institutions" (p. 78).

#### The Student Affairs Sector of Institutional Administration

Institutions themselves have no voice but are reflections of the combined attitudes, beliefs, and behavior of the individuals within those institutions. Thus, in order to investigate possible differences in resistance to change among institutions varied by type, size and permanency, the student affairs sector of postsecondary institutions was selected as the research population for several reasons.

Student affairs programs are found in most postsecondary institutions and are generally considered to be an integral part of institutional administration. Secondly, student affairs "lies at the heart of the relationship between institutions and their students" (Mayhew, 1974, p. 23). As such, student affairs is that part of administration which is particularly sensitive to shifting social changes affecting the student population. The third reason members of student affairs staffs were selected for research is that student affairs programs and

activities hold an adjunct position to the institution's primary responsibility of educating the population. Thus, monies now allocated for some student affairs programs may be particularly sensitive to financial pressures from a changing economy.

L. B. Mayhew (1974) observed that the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education had published little about the student personnel movement. He suggested "perhaps the commission correctly sensed that student personnel services are in flux, and that many once operative positions will be replaced" (p. 23). If the Carnegie Commission has somewhat neglected the student affairs segment in their extensive analyses of postsecondary education, other educational writers have not. Many have reviewed prevalent social, governmental and financial trends in education today and predicted these trends may alter the student affairs segment of campus life in a variety of ways.

#### Problem Statement

The purpose of this research is to examine the extent to which institutional resistance to future changes in student affairs may vary according to institutional type, institutional size, and institutional permanency as perceived by student affairs practitioners in public postsecondary institutions. More specifically this study will address the following questions:

1. In the perception of student affairs practitioners, are universities more resistant to future change in student affairs than community colleges?

2. In the perception of student affairs practitioners, are large institutions more resistant to future change in student affairs than small institutions?
3. In the perception of student affairs practitioners, are long established institutions more resistant to future change in student affairs than more recently established institutions?

### Delimitations

As the above problem was researched, the following delimitations were observed:

1. Research was confined to the state university system and the community college system in Florida from which four universities and four community colleges were selected that varied in size and length of time in existence.
2. The respondent sample in each institution was confined to vice-presidents and deans of student affairs, and other practitioners with some administrative responsibility in student affairs programs and activities.
3. The statements comprising the testing instrument were confined to predictions of future change in the student affairs segment of institutions as affected by prevalent trends of increased state and federal control, changing student profiles and values, the consumerism movement, financial constraints, and demands for accountability.

### Limitations

As the problem under investigation was researched, the following limitations were observed. Postsecondary educational institutions may

vary on dimensions other than size, type, and length of time in existence which is beyond the scope of this study. Differences in the quality and quantity of leadership among members of an institution, the amount of funding available, decision making patterns, and/or degree of departmental interaction as examples, may have an effect on institutional acceptance or resistance to future change.

The data were analyzed utilizing a 2x2x2 analysis of variance design. As Florida has no public small, old universities or community colleges which fit the stated criteria, two cells of the design were blank. However, it was possible to compute variance between the main effects of institutional size, institutional type, and institutional permanency, and the two-way interaction of institutional size by type and institutional type by permanency. Analysis of interaction of institutional size by permanency was obtained through a Student's t statistic.

An additional limitation was the researcher developed instrument. As no instrument existed by which to measure resistance to future change in student affairs, the reliability and validity of the researcher developed instrument have not yet been established.

#### Justification

This problem is worthy of investigation because, during the present time period when a myriad of forces are pressing for change in educational institutions, so little is known about the role of organizational features and institutional characteristics in resistance to change. There has been a long history of research by anthropologists, psychologists, economists, and sociologists dealing in some way with the planning and diffusion of innovative change. In education, programs, strategies,

and models have evolved based on this research. In the main, a large share of the research has been conducted for military or industrial purposes and that part of the available research deemed applicable to education has been applied in educational institutions on a small scale, directed at individuals, small groups, or isolated programs (Guba, 1967, pp. 120-121). As reported by Goodlad (1975, p. XIII): "No matter how simple or ingenious, the salient fact about these programs to produce change was that they did not seem to work." Goodlad suggested that the basic cause for failure of change efforts in education stems from the fact that each institution is a natural system and efforts to change one segment without taking into account the properties of the whole system will not produce change.

Mann, in 1957, stated:

Relatively little is known about organizational change or the study of dynamics in institutional social systems. Systematic quantifiable measurements of change in complex organizational settings is in its infancy. (pp. 146-7)

A 1978 computer review of available research literature, covering a twelve year span, revealed little effort has been made since 1957 to study this problem. Baldrige and Deal (1975, p. 3) said that research on change has been largely limited to measurement of single inventions and factors which will impede or affect the adoption of an invention on an individualistic basis despite the fact that most social inventions are used by organizations rather than by individuals:

More attention to organizational features in the innovation process is needed because organizations are now the major adopters of social inventions and because organizational factors and organizational dynamics are the major independent variables that seem to influence the amount, the rate, and the permanency of innovation. (p. 160)



In the "buyers market" of the next decade, systematic planning for change will be instrumental to the health if not the survival of many institutions (Martorana & Kuhns, 1975, p. 7). Therefore, it is hoped that this research study may contribute to knowledge regarding the effects of three institutional characteristics or the acceptance of, or resistance to, change processes.

#### Assumptions

1. It is assumed that practitioners in student affairs, as one of the major administrative divisions of colleges and universities (Mayhew, 1974, p. 23) will reflect the attitudes and traditional beliefs of the institution as a whole through their position in an intricate network of role relationships that hold their shape as a consequence of shared values, shared solutions to problems, and shared sanctions for deviance and conformity (Sieber, 1975, p. 94).
2. It is assumed that predictions made by contemporary educational writers of future changes in student affairs activities elicited sufficient response of acceptance of, or resistance to, change.

#### Definition of Terms

Large institution. A postsecondary institution with a student population over 20,000.

New institution. A postsecondary institution which has been in existence 20 years or less.

Old institution. A postsecondary institution which has been in existence 50 years or longer.

Small institution. A postsecondary institution with a student population under 7,000.

Student affairs. That segment of the administration of postsecondary institutions which concerns student activities other than academic classwork. May often be referred to in the literature as student personnel work, student services, or student development.

Student affairs practitioners. For purposes of this research, those persons involved in activities of postsecondary campus life whose major function is one of an administrative nature, that is, vice-presidents, deans, assistant deans, and directors of student affairs departments, programs, or activities.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Current literature which is available on the innovation, diffusion, strategies for, and the adoption of change in institutions and organizations is prolific. Baldrige and Deal (1975, p. 2) said: "Social scientists and educators have produced an enormous body of literature that continues to grow at a staggering rate." Despite the relative wealth of related literature on change innovation, findings that can be directly generalized to situations in educational institutions are limited. Most innovation studies concern either individuals or organizations of a military or entrepreneurial nature (Goodlad, 1975, pp. 14-16; Guba, 1967, p. 120). Of the innovative models and strategies for change innovation which are educational in content, most deal with education on the primary and secondary levels (see Culver & Hoban, 1973; and Morrish, 1976, in the reference list).

There is a distinct difference between change innovation and change of a general nature with which this research is concerned. Morrish (1976, p. 11) defined change innovation as proposed change which involves the element of deliberate planning or intention. In contrast, general change is defined more broadly by several theorists as any activity which alters the status quo (Zaltman, Florio, & Sikorski, 1977, p. 30). Miles (1964, p. 14) defined innovation as a species of the genus "change," a deliberate, novel, and specific change which is planned. Gibboney (1967) recognized this difference:

A recognized gap is present when educational change is viewed as a general process. For example, out of "X" change events what, if any, elements are common to all events? Or what conditions best promote a particular category of innovation in a given educational context? And the research literature is mute on which of the change mechanisms may be most fruitful for diffusing a particular type of innovation in a school system with particular characteristics. (pp. 119-120)

Studies of resistance to change in postsecondary education, either as resistance to innovation or resistance to change as a general process, are equally as sparse. A computer search of research relating to resistance to change from 1966 to the present in postsecondary education revealed limited research involving faculty resistance to innovation, no studies involving resistance to change of administration or of student affairs, and no research involving change in institutions related to type of institutions, size of institutions, or length of time institutions have been in existence.

Thus, as a matter of practicality, this review of the literature was limited to propositions and principles of theorists regarding resistance to change as a general process and change as applicable to the size, type, and permanency of an institution. As change which may take place in postsecondary institutions was limited to the sector of student affairs in this research, the development and status today of student affairs in universities and community colleges was reviewed, followed by speculations and predictions made by contemporary educational writers of the future state of student affairs as they may be affected by current external trends of state and federal control, financial constraints, changing student profiles and values, accountability, and the consumerism movement.

### Resistance to Change in Education

Educational systems, whether of the elementary, secondary, or postsecondary levels, are more resistant to change or innovation than industrial or business enterprises (Morrish, 1976, p. 55). Miles (1964, p. 443) argued that education is a permanent system and thereby most of the available energy is utilized to carry out routine goal directed activity and to maintain existing relationships. Too, education is a social system provided by society to fulfill one of its goals: Society does not usually encourage change, or anticipate it, in one of its long-term established systems, especially when young, impressionable minds are concerned (Morrish, 1976, p. 57). Thirdly, educational institutions strive to achieve and maintain an equilibrium and tend to avoid any threat to their gained stability (Griffiths, 1969, p. 363).

Postsecondary education is particularly resistant to change. Hefferlin (1969, pp. 11-16) found in a four year Study of Institutional Vitality of 110 American colleges and universities that postsecondary institutional resistance to change rested on a series of factors. Postsecondary institutions are highly influenced by faculty and their concept of academic freedom. Institutional organizations tend toward authoritarianism and ritualism, and are deliberately structured and vertically fragmented to avoid precipitant change. Institutional systems are inherently passive and conservative, and institutional reputation is not based on innovation. A follow-up report by Hefferlin (1971) summarized research that had been done on academic reform and the resistance to it which is applicable to this review:

Academic or curricular change is first of all organizational change and colleges and universities are organized and run in such a way as to prevent interference meddling and rapid change. Like other organizations they change as the result of pressure for change, and they adapt their operations to retain equilibrium. The major variables that determine this process of adjustment are: (1) individual, and refer to the advocates interested in change; (2) environmental, and refer to the resources available for change; and (3) structural, and refer to the openness of institutions to change. (ERIC abstract)

Resistance to change is not exhibited by institutions as such but by the individuals within the institution. An important source of resistance is found in the real or perceived threat that the individual may experience and to which he may react defensively (Huberman, 1973, p. 45; Zander, 1964, p. 543). G. Watson (1967, pp. 106-115) identified forces which produce resistance in individuals: homeostasis, or the desire to maintain a balance; preference for familiar habits and for the "old traditional ways"; preference to maintain known beliefs rather than new untried beliefs; desire to maintain the secure and normal; and dependence upon the accepted patterns of behavior which have been structured by the peer group to which one belongs.

In organizations, individuals do not function alone but within a social membership system. Group membership determines the behavior, attitudes, beliefs, and values of the members (Bennis, Benne, & Chin, 1961, pp. 701-702). G. Watson (1973, pp. 124-126) and Zaltman et al. (1977, pp. 34-37) described the forces which contribute to resistance to change in social membership systems as: conformity to norms; group solidarity; organizational rigidity; and restricted or inadequate information regarding the expected or proposed change. Watson added the hierarchical structure within which the group functions and the nature of the proposed change within the affluent capability of the

organization. Zaltman et al. added the conflict and factionalism which may be elicited by the proposed or expected change.

An important source of resistance to change in organizations is found in the real or perceived threat that change poses to the status of the members (Blau & Scott, 1962, p. 100; Willower, 1963). When a proposed change appears to be of benefit to one part of an organization at the expense of other parts, resistance may occur (Willower, 1963). Conflict among sub-parts may ensue (Griffiths, 1969, p. 373) particularly over the allocation of scarce personnel, money, or time (Atwood, 1964, p. 76).

As theorists have indicated, resistance to change processes of a general nature may be brought about from a variety of sources. Forms of resistance to change may vary with the amount of resistance which has been generated within a group. Consequences of resistance to change may be exhibited by members of a group overtly or implicitly, may be immediate or deferred (Huse, 1975, p. 12) and may run from verbal hostility to organizational sabotage (Willower, 1963).

Resistance to change as a general process, its causes and effects, has been discussed above as applying to all postsecondary institutions. The focus of this research is on differences in resistance to change between institutions which vary in type, size, and length of time in existence. No research studies have been found regarding these presumed variables. Following are propositions and positions expounded by theorists.

#### Institutional Type

Perhaps the largest difference between universities and community colleges, which are pertinent to this study, can be found in their

respective missions. Baldridge and Deal (1975, p. 11) pointed out that differences in institutional missions and the goals and objectives arrived at to meet respective missions may have an effect on change procedures and strategies employed to effect productive change. Whereas universities are preponderately devoted to research and expansion of knowledge, limit admissions to those students who are able to meet institutional criteria, and provide post-graduate work in a variety of areas, community colleges are dedicated to teaching, have essentially a policy of admission to all, and strive to provide educational programs that fit the need of the community college district (Gleazer, 1976). The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1970, p. 9) drew parallels between the revolutionary changes brought to postsecondary education by land-grant institutions, which were the outcome of the Morrill Act of 1862, and development of community colleges which, in turn, are accepting, reshaping, and extending the service philosophy of the land-grant movement. Dugger (1976) said community colleges are characterized by their flexibility and ability to adapt to changing conditions as opposed to universities. According to Knoell (1976) the strength of the community colleges has been their ability to respond creatively to state and local needs for new programs relatively quickly and to respond to educational desires of a remarkably diverse student population. The relative newness of community colleges in postsecondary educational endeavor and their diversity in providing programs to answer local needs may perhaps allow for less resistance to change, especially change imposed from external sources.



### Institutional Size

Two characteristics affecting an organization's capacity to change are size and administrative complexity; these factors are closely related (Baldrige & Deal, 1975, p. 160). According to Blau (1970) many studies have shown that increases in organizational size are directly related to increases in complexity as measured by hierarchical levels, the number of administrative positions, and the ratio of administrators to other employees. The main function of the hierarchical assignment of responsibility is to validate authority along a descending scale throughout the organization (Presthus, 1965, p. 34), which brings about an inflexibility in meeting technological and social pressures for change. Large organizations resist creativity because the hierarchical structure muffles demands that do not conform to the norm of the organization (Abbott, 1969, pp. 44-45; Presthus, 1965, pp. 9, 291), particularly when sub-units of large organizations are independent of each other making it difficult to introduce change into large organizations because of conflict between sub-units (Griffiths, 1969, p. 373).

On the other hand, some theorists proposed that the properties of organizational complexity and large size promote innovative behavior because of specialized expertise in sub-units and because of critical masses of problems that demand solutions (Hage & Aiken, 1967; Miles, 1964, p. 9; Sapolsky, 1967). Baldrige and Deal (1975, pp. 151-175) reported findings from a series of Stanford studies in 1968 which examined 20 randomly selected schools in seven districts in the San Francisco Bay area. It was found that a perfect positive rank order relationship existed between district size and increased adoption of innovations. Baldrige and Deal hypothesized from these findings

that more role specialization will support an increase in innovation. Thus, large organizations may often initiate change more readily than smaller organizations through a decentralization of authority but, for change to succeed, centralization of support from administration is necessary (Baldrige & Deal, 1975, p. 164; Zaltman et al., 1977, p. 36). Miles (1964, p. 647) suggested, however, that generalizations regarding the pre-change state of institutions which are under study are infrequent and may have a direct bearing on acceptance or rejection of change.

### Institutional Permanency

A third property of postsecondary institutions under study in this investigation is the relationship of acceptance of, or resistance to, change and the length of time an institution has been in existence. Some institutions have their roots deep in history and have developed traditions and patterns that have evolved over a long period of time. These historical patterns will strongly influence acceptance or rejection of change (Baldrige & Deal, 1975, pp. 15-16; Miller, R. I., 1967, pp. 11-12). Hefferlin (1969, p. 102) cited a college president who said: "Organizations just get lethargic as they grow older. They have policies for policies sake which soon become ritual." Sarason (1971, p. 18) suggested that historical permanency in an institution is a formidable obstacle to overcome when either small or large scale change is contemplated. According to Sarason, organizations are governed to a large extent by the traditions and habits that have evolved over time as a way of behaving for survival. Thus, members of institutions that have been in existence over an extended period have a vested interest

in maintaining the traditions of the institution as a way of preserving institutional character and will resist change as a threat to institutional survival.

### Historical Development of Student Affairs

In the early American colleges up to the period of the Civil War, higher education was for the most part private and in the hands of clergy. The greater share of the curriculum was devoted to the preparation of students for religious roles. To this end, early "personnel work" consisted of a "persistent emphasis on extra-curricular religion and also a considerable snooping into the personal lives of students" (Cowley, 1949, p. 20) fostered by clerical desire to save souls rather than educate minds. The college president served as chief student personnel worker dealing with the morals, manners, and spiritual development of students (Williamson, 1961, p. 5), the college assuming full parental responsibility for the young people enrolled (Corson, 1975, p. 109). As the president more often than not was a teaching member and also responsible for total management of the college, special assistants, usually former faculty members, were employed to serve as disciplinarians and informal advisors (Corson, 1975, p. 110).

In 1837 Oberlin College opened its doors equally to men and women. To forestall anticipated undesirable repercussions, President Finney set the theme for later deans by appointing "a wise and pious matron with such lady assistants as to keep up sufficient supervision" (Holmes, 1939, pp. 6-7). Males at Oberlin continued to be controlled and supervised by the college president, his few assistants, or, in the limited time allowed them, by the proctors and lecturers of the period.

The secularization of education and of American life in general brought a change to this kind of personnel work. According to Mueller (1961):

After the passage of the Land Grant College Act of 1862 new utilitarian institutions arose, and lay professors soon outnumbered the clerics. Many of these professors had journeyed to Germany for their training; there they were imbued with a thoroughgoing intellectual impersonalism, which led them to a complete disregard for students outside of class hours. (p. 52)

In 1870 the president of Harvard appointed a dean of the college whose duties included attention to discipline and enrollment procedures (Williamson, 1961, p. 5) and in 1890 a dean of student relations (Cowley, 1949, p. 20) who concerned himself with student counseling rather than student control (Mueller, 1961, p. 52). President Gilman, of Johns Hopkins, appointed the first "chief of faculty advisors" in 1889, observing that "in every institution there should be one or more persons specifically appointed to be counselors or advisors of students" (Cowley, 1949, p. 20).

Contrary to the tradition in England where good housing facilities were provided for students and where masters often lived with them to tutor and supervise, most American college officials spurned for many decades the building of on-campus residences. Only Yale officials persisted in the philosophy that the communal life of students had high educational value (Mueller, 1961, p. 52). Not until the 1890s, when Yale man William Rainey Harper became president of the University of Chicago, did the student housing movement gather force and spread to other public and private institutions (Cowley, 1949, p. 20).

Other services for students proliferated in the last two decades of the 1800s. The first formal orientation for incoming students was

introduced in Boston University in 1888 to acquaint them with the complexities of campus living (Drake, 1966); health services began when medical personnel, hired to supervise the medical treatment for athletic teams, found themselves caring for other students as well (Packwood, 1977, p. 298); college unions developed from social centers for debating societies (Packwood, 1977, p. 179); and college activity began which promoted placement for graduating students (Blaska & Schmidt, 1977, p. 368).

The modern concept of student personnel work generally is attributed to Frank Parsons and his influence on vocational guidance for the individual student at Boston College in 1908 (Lloyd-Jones, 1954, pp. 1-3). Psychological testing, and vocational guidance and testing for classification and assignment of men was developed during World War One. These armed forces techniques were adopted by colleges as part of the counseling process. During the 1940s the rapid expansion of knowledge in the social sciences led to the belief that student counseling should be emphasized based on individual needs.

Financial aid to students through charity funds or private endowments was available to only a chosen few until the United States was well into the depression. In 1933, funds made available by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, created to help states by providing "work relief," were utilized by the state of Minnesota to support students while attending school. The idea quickly spread to colleges nationwide (Henry, 1975, p. 4). With the G I Bill after World War Two and the 1958 National Education Act, the federal government substantially entered into financial aid support programs for college students (Daneells, 1977, pp. 52-53).

Almost imperceptibly, specialization of services to students under the aegis of the student affairs mantle developed during the 1930s and the 1940s. Lloyd-Jones (1954, p. 4) attributed the specialization trend to (1) the step-by-step development of student personnel work; (2) the rapid growth and expansion of colleges and universities, the larger institutions setting the pace for the smaller; and (3) the bureaucratic determination of finer and finer functions within institutions, complete with formal job descriptions. Concern with the "whole student" reached its high point during the 1950s (Corson, 1975, p. 110). In 1958 the American Council Committee on the Administration of Student Personnel Work categorized the services performed or coordinated by student personnel workers as:

Selection for admission	Special clinics
Registration and records	remedial reading
Counseling	study habits
Health service	speech and hearing
Housing and food service	Special services
Student activities	student orientation
Financial aid	veterans advisory service
Placement	marriage counseling
Discipline	religious activities and counseling

Some categories may be managed by other departments.  
Counseling may be vocational, psychological, personal,  
or educational in nature. (p. 16)

Since 1958, programs and departments relating to student services have gained some stability and have established organizational patterns to maintain that stability within the postsecondary educational community (Miller, T., 1977, p. XI). On numerous campuses, these activities require staffs of hundreds of individuals, many of whom are highly specialized and professionally trained. Between 1957 and 1972, the number of professional student personnel workers grew twice as rapidly as did aggregate enrollments (Corson, 1975, p. 124).

Today, although the student affairs services offered students are essentially the same as in 1958, priorities have shifted to some degree. With the decline of the concept of in loco parentis which had afforded postsecondary institutions "control of the students commensurate with that of the parent in all matters pertaining to the institution" (Alexander & Solomon, 1972, p. 411), disciplinary issues have to a certain extent evolved into matters prescribed by law. Financial aid services have expanded considerably with rising educational costs and movement toward equal entitlement to a postsecondary education for every American.

Although the range of services has broadened, the status of student affairs practitioners has not grown proportionately. The general attitudes toward student affairs practitioners of undergraduates, faculty members, presidents, and trustees was described by Corson: Many undergraduates view the dean of student affairs and his staff as an authority symbol over their personal behavior. Faculty members look down on student affairs practitioners from the vantage point of their scholarly heights and their influence on the student affairs function is often negative or even disintegrating. College presidents view student affairs ambiguously: at times as a controller and manipulator of students, at other times as an advocate of students. Trustees tend to discount their professional judgements and recommendations (1975, pp. 125, 207).

#### Student Services in Community Colleges

Although the first successful junior college was established in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901, the post-World War Two years were the period

of expansive growth of the two-year institution (Schneider, 1977, p. 450). In the decade between 1968 and 1978, the number of public, two-year community, junior, and technical postsecondary institutions nationwide increased from 739 to 1,047 (Gilbert, 1979, p. 2). Gallagher (1974, p. 101) described the two-year postsecondary institution as not a new variety of higher education but a new way of packaging it and making postsecondary education available to an additional sector of the population such as the commuter and part-time student. Generally, the two-year college attracts three major streams of students: (1) Students interested in vocational training, the curricula pragmatically determined by the industrial and commercial demands of the college district; (2) students interested in general education courses which parallel those offered in the four-year institutions for articulation to the four-year institutions; and (3) students interested in a broad array of continuing education and adult courses. Within this framework and with an open door policy, the two-year junior or community college hosts a student population which is highly diverse and covers a broad spectrum of student interests and abilities. As such, services outside the classroom for students focus less on the efficient functioning of services common to four-year institutions but more on the needs and development of the individual student (O'Banion, Thurston, & Gulden, 1970).

Housing of students, common to most four-year institutions excepting some in urban settings, is much less common to the two-year sector, especially those in the more populated eastern and southeastern states. As many of the students live at home and many are employed, the campus is not the center of student life and consequently students



are less interested in campus extra-curricular activities (George & George, 1971). While counseling is a large part of the student affairs programs of the four-year college, it is considered the key to the whole student affairs program in the two-year college (Watson, J., 1968).

Schneider (1977), in comparing services offered in the community and junior colleges with services in the four-year institutions noted:

On the whole the individual student personnel services in the junior colleges are similar in purpose and function to their parallel services in the four year institutions of higher education. Due to the student-centered philosophy and the demands of a heterogeneous population, different emphases and functions are apparent in junior college student personnel services. (p. 465)

Parker (1977, p. XVIII) described student affairs, in both two-year and four-year colleges and universities, as an American peculiarity. He stated that in most countries students fend for themselves, are recognized as adults, and faculty provide what assistance is required as part of their regular duties. According to Parker, no other country has invested "the resources in either money or personnel to provide the elaborate superstructure" of services to the student which is common to American postsecondary institutions. Cowley (1964) noted the numbers of persons in student affairs services had multiplied at least 25 times from 1934 to 1964. Institutional budgets had grown from a few thousand dollars to more than a million in some universities and increased proportionately in most small institutions, consuming about 4% of the institutional budget (Corson, 1975, p. 206).

#### Trends Affecting Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Numerous educational writers have become aware of social, financial, technological, and governmental trends which may have direct and

indirect consequences for the functioning of postsecondary institutions. At the very least, "there exists a sense of uncertainty as to how well universities are likely to fare in the future" (Perkins, C., 1977, p. 215). Perkins discussed three pervasive organizational inadequacies: size and complexity, specialization, and the shifting pattern of institutional government. Cheit (1974, p. 406), recognizing the severity of financial conditions, said three emergent problems must be solved: painful readjustment of priorities, coping with new and highly critical political and public attitudes about education, and finding ways for institutions to flourish in a generally stabilizing economy. According to an article in U.S. News & World Report, May 29, 1978, entitled "U.S. Colleges-Life and Death Struggle," the assessment of some of leading American scholars was that hundreds of schools will close in the next few years despite the trimming of faculty and boosting of tuitions in attempts to meet today's crisis.

No corner of the postsecondary system does not feel the pressure of external forces. Bogard (1972) stated:

Higher education stands accused of poor planning, of being insensitive to the needs of society, of ignoring technological developments that could make teaching more effective, of being unable to provide valid information on its operations, of ineffectual use of its resources. (p. 9)

The trends of financial constraints, state and federal control, the changing student profile and values, the consumerism movement, and accountability which have been selected for this study are affecting all aspects of postsecondary education and it appears they will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. Although a thorough review of the literature concerning the effects of the selected trends on all aspects of postsecondary institutions is beyond the scope of the planned research, a few selected factors merit brief discussion.

Since the 1960s federal funding of educational programs has been impressive. Through its selection of programs to support, the federal government exercises a direct influence over the future of many institutions and the shaping of their programs (Martorana & Kuhns, 1975, pp. 5-6). Wattenbarger (1974, p. 1) called attention to the shift in decision-making from institutions to state level agencies, and the concomitant shift in power over appropriations, planning, resource allocation, programs, and even quality control. Martorana and Kuhns (1975, p. 3) traced the public disenchantment with higher education as the main cause which has resulted in legislative demands for faculty accountability and increased attention to productive performance. Meanwhile, faculty is beset with concerns of its own: the previously inviolate tenure system is losing support from organizations such as boards of regents and unions (Henderson & Henderson, 1975, p. 179; Nisbet, 1973), and from funding bodies (Costello, 1975). As a projected result, "during the final quarter of this century faculty unionization will continue to increase significantly" (Crossland, 1976).

All of the above trends are intensified by the very real financial stresses most postsecondary institutions are undergoing (Cheit, 1974, p. 405; Pifer, 1977, pp. 62-63; "U.S. Colleges Life and Death Struggle," 1978). Cost reductions in the present inflationary period appear to be paramount. However, as pointed out by Freeman and Holloman (1975), institutional rigidity, present modes of instruction, and the increasing proportion of tenured professors will operate to make cost reductions difficult. Only drastic changes, according to many critics, will remove weaknesses found in many postsecondary institutions today.

### Trends Affecting Student Affairs

With the background of general uncertainty in postsecondary educational institutions as a whole, uncertainty also pervades student affairs. Have the traditional, extra-curricular services provided by institutions for students out-lived their usefulness? The demise or radical alteration of student affairs as a segment of campus life has been predicted (Bucci, 1977; Harvey, 1976; Humphries, 1977; Hurst & Ivey, 1971). At the very least, many contemporary educational writers who have commented about student affairs feel changes are imminent and have speculated on how trends of increased state and federal control, changing student profiles and values, the consumerism movement, financial constraints, and demands for accountability will impact on the programs and activities sponsored by student affairs in the future. It is emphasized that these trends rarely operate singly but are often a convergence of two or more trends. The following predictions and speculations have been abstracted in the most part from published material. In order to maintain continuity and a sense of future this section of the review of the literature will depart from established procedure by the employment of the present and future tense when appropriate.

### Changing Student Profiles

The changing college student and what this portends for post-secondary institutions may have far reaching effects on the future of extra-curricular campus life according to a number of contemporary writers. As suggested by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1975, p. 1), "higher education in the United States is

undergoing the greatest overall and long-run rate of decline in its growth patterns in all of its history." It has been reported that 1960 and 1961 were peak years for births. The college-bound segment of this population will be entering the postsecondary educational system in the next two years. Thereafter enrollment of the traditional 18 to 21 year old student will begin to drop. Kindergarten enrollment nationwide dropped 3,000,000 in 1977 and 4.7 million since 1970 ("More people over 25 are going to college," 1978, p. 2). With projections such as these it has been predicted that the conventional undergraduate programs will continuously decline in population from the late 1970s to the end of this century (Driscoll, 1977; Gallagher, 1974, p. 199; Pfnister, 1976, p. 5) and "will have shrunk by perhaps close to one third of the 1970 levels" (Dresch, 1975, p. 83).

Decreasing enrollments have been, and will continue to be, affected by four other factors: abolition of the draft, increased costs of college going, changes in the job market for college graduates, and liberalizing of college regulations to permit the interruption of college careers by stopping-in and stopping-out (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975, p. IX; Sanford, 1968, p. 191). Prospective students will be more inclined to "shop around" in the inevitable shift to a buyers market (Martorana & Kuhns, 1975, p. 6), once entered will "stop-out" one or more times during their college careers ("When in Doubt, 'Stop out'," 1978), and will be more mobile, changing institutions more often (Mayhew, 1969, p. 224). Partially due to the convergence of salary levels in jobs for college graduates with jobs available for non-graduates, and to the declining market

for college graduates (Freeman & Holloman, 1975; Hause, 1971), there is a decided shift to vocationally oriented, credential-providing programs (Corson, 1975, p. 219). Wise (1976) predicted that non-college educational opportunities in private technical schools and the like will double enrollments, largely but not entirely because of increased public spending in this sector through subsidized tuition. There has also been a recognized shift in student preference away from traditional formal programs in colleges and universities to other kinds of post-secondary learning experiences such as external degree programs, off-campus learning, and university without walls programs (Eurich, N., 1975, pp. 221-231; Martorana & Kuhns, 1975, p. 4; Pfnister, 1976, p. 5).

The age range of the college population is changing. The average college student can no longer be thought of as the 18 to 21 year old. C. D. Perkins (1977, p. 86), citing the 1974 Bureau of Census statistics, reported that college attendance of students 25 years of age and older comprised one third of the total student population. One million were 35 years of age and older. Increasingly, postsecondary education will not be concentrated in a few years following high school but will be spread out over a lifetime (Martorana & Kuhns, 1975, p. 4; Mood, 1973, p. 57).

The future college population will have wide variations in backgrounds, interests, and abilities among minorities, females, and older adults (Pfnister, 1976, pp. 77-78). The future student will be more mature, know more, be more sophisticated about faculty concerns, curricular problems, administrative faculty clashes, and budget controversies and demand a voice in their resolution (Harvey, 1976;

Penny, 1972, p. 25). As student power continues to develop in an increasing buyers market, students will gain equality in the decision making process and planning in such matters as faculty evaluation, program structure, institutional policies and regulations, expenditure of available funds, and the like (Corson, 1975, p. 287; Schwartz, 1971, p. 147). A 1970 study by McGrath involving 875 American colleges and universities found that in 88.3% of the institutions in the sample students were participating on one or more faculty curriculum committees; 34.3% on committees relating to student life; 31.2% on library committees; 29.1% in public events and lectures; 22.7% on faculty executive committees; 18.6% on matters involving discipline; 17.5% on admissions committees; and in 9.7% of the institutions students were involved in matters pertaining to planning. In governance concerns, students sat on the board or had membership on trustee boards in 10.6% of the sample institutions but held voting membership in only 2.7%.

Kemerer (1977) noted the growth of student lobbying, now in over 20 states (Brunner, 1974), and development of student unionization. Several student unions have emerged on eastern campuses, most of which receive support from student governments. The student unions appear to be partly consumer oriented and partly a stepping stone to a more powerful student status. The continuing unionization of faculty members is seen as a source of stimulation for the increasing growth of student unions. Due to faculty collective bargaining and increased power in administration students, faculty, and administration are polarizing to become natural adversary groups (Wise, 1976). Almost invariably collective bargaining agreements of faculty ignore the student interests,

abrogating the student voice and role gained in recent years (Olsen, 1974). Student unions may balance the power of faculty unions, carrying on their own negotiations with both faculty and administration, or directly with trustees and government officials (Gallagher, 1974, pp. 191-192).

Student affairs practitioners themselves will become more organized and bargain collectively as a viable method for representing their own interests. This movement will become necessary as college student personnel work is seen as a supportive service with educational and developmental responsibilities but primarily concerned with supervisory and managerial functions. It is likely that the present flexibility of student affairs will be diminished as bargaining units constrict student affairs activity (Aaron, 1974; Coe, 1973).

It is predicted that as the student body gains equality, demands will be made of the institution which heretofore they have largely ignored (Penny, 1972, p. 87). As the traditional 18 to 21 college population decreases and the older, part-time, commuting student is recruited to meet enrollment demands, the traditional 8 am to 3 pm, Monday through Friday, semester or term structure, common to most universities, will change (Boyer, 1973, pp. 33-34; Martorana & Kuhns, 1975, p. 4). As the number of part-time learners increases, as more opportunities are opened up through space and time reorganization, classes will be held evenings, week-ends, and in concentrated time periods in both on- and off-campus settings (Bender, 1974, p. 70; Ostar, 1977). New educational calendars and new locations for study will become commonplace (Boyer, 1977, p. 74). The application of new



technologies will permit education to take place in business settings, public libraries, community learning centers, and other off-campus places (Corson, 1975, p. 219; Mayhew, 1977, p. 193).

There will be an increasing number of students who will opt for off-campus living facilities. As reported by Gallagher (1974, p. 193), census bureau surveys reveal that while dorm residents remained constant in numbers during the five year period ending in 1972, the numbers of students living away from home but in their own quarters increased from 1,400,000 to 2,400,000 of whom about 1,800,000 were married. Three quarters of American postsecondary students are no longer campus wards. It is predicted that to maintain present investments in campus living quarters, present dormitory space will be redesigned into alternative forms such as individual apartments, private quarters around a central kitchen, and the like (Gores, 1968, pp. 292-293; Mayhew, 1969, p. 226). Mayhew (1974, p. 23) suggested students themselves might assume responsibility for campus residence facilities in some form of co-operative arrangement with the institution.

With the changes in student population, it is projected that institutions will have increasingly less control over the non-academic sector of student lives (Mayhew, 1969, p. 225). The college or university will, in most instances, no longer be the "total institution" within which students spend their social and recreational periods (Corson, 1975, p. 219). Fewer will identify closely with an institution as postsecondary education becomes more and more a consumer activity (Penny, 1972, p. 74).

There is some evidence that student affairs programs and activities have not accommodated their services to the changing student population. Planning for services or needs assessment of students have not differentiated between the traditional 18 to 21 year old student and the increasing numbers of mature, career-oriented and commuter population (Horn, 1971, pp. 189-190; Fauquet, Note 1). Mayhew (1977) said:

Many of the practices of higher education, including the wide range of student personnel services, were designed to fulfill (the) custodial role and institutions did think of themselves as appropriate custodians. Given the reduction in the age of adulthood and the new alternative life-style of students, and given the increase in the discontinuities that characterize college attendance, it seems likely that the custodial role must inevitably diminish. With such a reduction, especially as commuting students come to predominate, it is then logical to expect a reduction in such services as the health care center, counseling clinic, campus dining rooms, and elaborate programs of recreation. (p. 50)

Projections of enrollment decline and a changing student population have come at a point in time when postsecondary educational institutions are beset with financial problems. Fewer enrolling students brings less dollars from the state treasury with which to operate the institutions. This prospect is appearing at the same time that institutional costs are rising.

### Financial Constraints

The budgetary depression experienced by colleges and universities is not a new phenomenon but rather a long term continuing trend. In the 1950s and 1960s, new federal money, increased state funding, expanding student population, and a relatively prosperous economy led to an unprecedented two decades of college expansion (Jencks & Riesman,

1968, p. 112). Between 1962 and 1971 state appropriations for public postsecondary institutions increased nearly threefold and the share of state general revenues allocated for postsecondary institutions increased from 11% to 15% (Glenny & Kidder, 1973, p. 14). By the early 1970s, postsecondary education had become a \$30 billion enterprise with an estimated additional \$5.9 billion provided by students in tuition and other education fees, and a \$4.4 billion in financial aid provided by federal, state, or local subsidy and private sources (National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, 1973, p. 67). In 1968, Barzun (p. 73) made reference to the financial difficulties institutions were beginning to experience and attributed it to four factors: (1) fixed costs rising, (2) endowments rising very little, (3) outside forces adding to the cost, and (4) tuition fees rising but not filling the gap. In this decade inflation and the resultant effects of increased costs plus the maintenance of existing personnel and facilities have substantially contributed to the condition colleges and universities find themselves in today (Mayhew, 1974, p. 39).

There does not appear to be a likely possibility of this trend reversing in the foreseeable future. Legislatures, not as supportive of postsecondary education as they have been in the past and controlling scarce dollars to spread among more pressing social demands, have become more resistant to budget increases (Mayhew, 1969, p. 226; Pifer, 1977, pp. 62-63). Mood (1973, p. 20), speculating on the future of higher education, predicted that in the next decade educational budgets "will be substantially reduced as a consequence of declining enrollments,

reduction of popular support for higher education in social priorities, and decreased tax support." Both legislators and the public have become increasingly skeptical that ever larger investments in post-secondary education will in fact pay off (Newman, 1977, pp. 117-118). Pfnister (1976, p. 273) reported "in 1975-76, words such as cut-back, layoff, retrenchment, and budget cutting had become commonplace."

The various agencies within the federal government have reduced allocation of categorical grants (Cheit, 1974, p. 105). Many universities have less money available for basic research, thus eroding research programs and contributing to faculty and support personnel cuts. Despite mounting evidence of reduction of funds from federal sources, pressures from postsecondary institutions continue for more governmental assistance. A national weekly news magazine ("U.S. Colleges Life and Death Struggle", 1978) which reviewed funding of postsecondary institutions stated:

Federal officials are telling colleges they are living in a fool's paradise if they think Washington is going to bail them out of all their difficulties. The White House and Congress, like so many state legislatures, are in no mood to increase spending on education substantially. (p. 66)

Colleges and universities have met the fiscal restraints imposed upon them in a variety of ways. Support personnel such as secretaries, grounds keepers, and maintenance workers have been sharply cut back. Energy for lighting and heating of buildings and for transportation services has been curtailed. Salary increases have been limited and travel reimbursement reduced. Plans to obtain private money through endowments and alumni were strengthened. Prospective students have been actively solicited to maintain enrollments, library expenditures have been reduced (Corson, 1975, pp. 181-183).

A number of colleges under pressure of enrollment declines and financial crises made cuts in student affairs personnel (Humphries, 1977). The professional incumbents of the positions, classified as support positions in organizational charts, unless a part-time faculty member, do not enjoy the privileges and status that faculty members do, such as sabbatical leave and tenure rights (Corson, 1975, p. 205; Humphries, 1977). Thus, personnel in student affairs are particularly susceptible to fiscal retrenchment. A few institutions in drastic economy moves have eliminated student personnel divisions entirely, others have imposed substantial staff reduction. A few institutions are experimenting with organizational patterns that place all student affairs functions in the hands of the faculty as they were previously (Humphries, 1977). Harvey (1976) suggested that faculty members, in a fiscally uncertain future, will find the area of student development one of the few growth areas left for excess faculty and will displace professional student affairs personnel.

Millett (1977, pp. 69-70) predicted that, in the era of fiscal restraints, most postsecondary institutions will continue to experience the utilization of space and costs by student affairs will be substantially reduced, especially those of high costs, as it becomes increasingly difficult for institutions to balance expenditures for such services with income from those services. Student affairs programs and staff salaries will become increasingly dependent upon student activity fees as opposed to general institutional support or state revenues (Howell & Sandeen, Note 2). Non-academic services such as housing, child care services, counseling, health services and auxiliary programs will either be placed

under independent management or be required to be self-supporting through a fee charge arrangement (Boyer, 1973, p. 36; Perkins, 1973, p. 251).

The lack of money available to fund positions and activities that are not exclusively academic has led to other means of providing services to students. A recent study by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in conjunction with the National Institute of Education ("Part-time Financial Aid Counselors in Institutions of Higher Education", 1977), reported that the use of part-time staff to perform a variety of services in the financial aid department was widespread. In the 2,829 institutions studied, 79% reported employment of part-time staff, 26% of which were assigned to counseling duties. Almost half of the institutions planned to introduce or expand part-time staff, the major increase planned for college work-study programs.

A wider utilization of paraprofessionals, either on a volunteer basis or for college credit has been recorded. Paraprofessionals are assigned to maintain and expand existing services, to develop and extend new services, and to provide input regarding needed programs (Gartner, Riessman, & Jackson, 1977, p. 154). This trend is likely to continue as money tightens in an inflationary economy. Institutional upper classmen, planning to go into administration or student affairs work, will function as peer counselors (Solomon, 1974), will be trained to tutor students in health matters (McKee, Harris, Rhodes, & York, 1977), and class scheduling, time management, transfer problems, and student aid programs (Minton, 1977).

Costs of postsecondary education, for both the institutions and for the students, have reached new heights and this trend appears likely to continue. Institutional administrators have made an effort to reduce expenditures but state legislators, in an era of competing needs and scarcer resources, have intensified their efforts to centralize control of postsecondary institutions under agencies of state government or legislative bodies.

### State and Federal Control

Control and governance of U. S. postsecondary institutions are shifting from the institutions to state boards and other state agencies. The new financial conditions are forcing the state centralized administrations into an aggressively managerial posture (Cheit, 1974, p. 412).

This shift has been a long-term trend dating from the beginning of this century. Florida in 1905 and Iowa in 1909 established rudimentary statewide coordinating boards. The movement toward centralization expanded and by 1970 public colleges and universities had become, in practically every state, parts of a state system. By 1972, 26 states had developed state coordinating boards with advisory and varying degrees of regulatory powers. In 21 states, consolidated governing boards, with full responsibility for institutions under their jurisdiction, had been established (Halstead, 1974, pp. 6-7). Faculty and institutional officers have lost much of their power to make decisions relating to most aspects of governing their campuses.

Other organizations within the state government besides state boards now have an effect on institutional control. State budgeting authorities have superseded the power of individual institutions

by making uniform regulations and applying them in blanket ways. Legislative staffs, involved in some way with educational matters, have been increased. In Florida, from 1967 to 1974, the numbers of legislative aides involved in some way in college and university decision-making, had tripled (Wattenbarger, 1974, p. 3).

Newman (1977, pp. 123-126) noted the steady bureaucratization of postsecondary education, and the pronounced trend toward centralization of power, and predicted this trend would accelerate. Institutions will have no more status than that of a unit within an increasingly centralized system (Corson, 1975, p. 219; Henderson, 1970, p. 225) under governance of governmental or quasi-governmental agencies (Ness, 1977, p. 137).

This apparent shift in control of institutions does not appear to be limited to states alone. Government aid to U.S. colleges and universities, mostly through student loans, research grants and special program funds, now totals \$15 billion yearly ("Federal aid: Too many strings," 1978). Educators are concerned with the increasing intrusion of federal control via choice of research area to support, systems of record keeping, and regulation by the federal government (Enarson, 1974; Huit, 1977, pp. 80-82).

As both centralization of institutional governance and state and federal regulations increase, roles and functions of student affairs practitioners are likely to be altered. The flexibility and scope of student services will continue to diminish on the campus and traditional services for the student will be determined by external standards (Blocker, 1974, p. 98; Corson, 1975, p. 219). With the expected increase in



rules and regulations for financial aid coupled with the expected expansion of both student need and funding sources, the office of financial aid will be placed under the jurisdiction of the business office in an administrative management role and coordination or combination of financial aid and the admissions functions will be mandated by state regulations (Fritz, Martin, & Sciame, 1976; Kimball, 1973).

State legislatures, in their endeavors to centralize control of postsecondary institutions, have been motivated by reduction of financial costs and by an equally strong force emanating from public sources--demands for accountability of public expenditures. State residents whose tax monies contribute to support of postsecondary institutions, and parents or students who must pay the increasing tuition costs have asked questions of their government representatives: Why does education cost so much? How are our monies being spent?

#### Demand for Accountability

For a variety of reasons, among which is public disenchantment of postsecondary education, the increasing cost of maintaining institutions in an era of scarce money, and the inability of institutions to guarantee jobs for their graduates, accountability of the institutions for their programs and expenditures for their offerings has taken on new meaning. Boards of trustees and regents, legislatures and federal agencies, parents and students are asking tough questions about what postsecondary education is accomplishing and how institutions spend their resources (Kerr, 1972, p. 8; Newman, 1977, p. 120). But

accountability based only on fiscal considerations is no longer sufficient. Accountability for results and effective performance is now expected (Folger, 1977, p. 91).

At present the problem of accounting for funding and services has three approaches: (1) performance budget which relates funding to outcomes or quality; (2) performance audit which measures the degree to which previously established goals and objectives have been reached; and (3) program review which is the assessment of the need for, and the effectiveness of, a proposed or existing program by examining it in depth (Folger, 1977, pp. VIII-IX). Postsecondary institutions will continue to be pressed for quantitative measures of efficiency and productivity and qualitative measures of outcomes and effectiveness. States will use an increasing variety of accountability processes and systems to attain effective utilization of scarce resources (Folger, 1977, p. XI; Peterson, Erwin, & Wilson, 1977, p. 29). Persons in institutions, boards of trustees or regents, and legislatures, themselves held accountable for performance and expenditures of public funds, are likely to insist on externally determined standards for cost effectiveness, and a cost benefit analysis of all programs and spending processes (Corson, 1975, p. 221; Eurich, A., 1968, p. 41). New accountability procedures are likely in a majority if not all states through a separate evaluation staff located in a state agency such as the audit agency (Folger, 1977, p. 76).

Programs and activities of student affairs are increasingly being required to be justified and student affairs staff are experimenting with the conceptualization and implementation of planning, budgeting and evaluation models (Bishop, 1975; Harpel, 1975; Hoenack,

1975; Trembley & Sharf, 1975). To assist student affairs officers in understanding the nature of accountability demands, the Division of Research and Program Development of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) conducted a survey of 912 student affairs administrators (Harpel, 1975). The findings indicated that state agencies, governing boards, and institutional administrators were most interested in the cost of a program rather than information relating to need for the program, outcomes, or legitimacy of a program. The interest displayed by faculty and students was just the reverse; both were interested in documentation of need and the legitimacy of programs.

The trend requiring measures of accountability of student affairs activities will likely continue. As enrollments drop and costs continue to rise, governmental entities and institutional administrators will require cost information. Faculty, also required to be accountable for their services and time, and safeguarding intrusion of student affairs into their interests, will question legitimacy of programs. Students will question the need for programs and activities for which they may have no need but for which they are required to pay (Boyer, 1973, p. 36; Harpel, 1975).

It appears, then, that institutions will increasingly be required to account for curricular and non-curricular activities and programs. At the same time, due in part to the rising costs to students for a college education and in part to the changing student population, postsecondary education is increasingly being viewed as a consumer service which is purchased, and institutions viewed as sellers of that service.

### The Consumerism Movement

The consumer movement in the United States can be traced to the 1960s when various interest groups spoke out in behalf of legitimate concerns about the competitive enterprise system. These groups maintained that the consumer has a right to complain, and receive redress through the courts, when products do not live up to advertising.

Postsecondary education has become a consumer activity in the last decade as the relationship between institutions and students has undergone significant change. Several reasons are responsible for the movement's growth in education. The older, more sophisticated students with an increased social and political consciousness have become more skeptical of judgements made on their behalf. Less involvement in an institution on the part of the student, the desire to improve occupational chances in a competitive job market, and the high cost of attending college contribute to students viewing themselves as consumers and protective of their rights as such. Bevilacqua (1976) said:

As a consumer of educational services, students are entitled to a fair return for their investment through truthful advertising, equity in admissions standards, student aid and loans, open methods of evaluation, realistic advising, specific regulations on dishonesty, and a clear delineation of all academic rules and expectations. (p. 491)

The right of students to be fairly and accurately informed has affected all areas of the campus. Publications disseminated by institutions extolling institutional virtues are required to reflect correct information regarding their facilities and services, explicit and clear statements of academic requirements, and the costs students are required to pay. The federal government has become involved in consumer protection for postsecondary students. The Higher Education Act of 1976 mandated that by mid-1977 information must be made available regarding

financial assistance, costs, and possible academic problems for all new and current students (Bonham, 1977). The American Council on Education (El-Khawas, 1976) has published guidelines for fair practice toward students. Through most state legislatures regulations are in effect, or will be forthcoming, that require full disclosure in advertising and recruiting of students by state institutions (Bevilacqua, 1976).

Compliance by postsecondary institutions with the federal and state regulations for fair treatment with which students are now protected are many and diverse. Written policies of recruitment, admissions, academic requirements and programs, institutional standards, on- and off-campus living costs, the drop-out rate and degree completion rate, placement records, and so forth, must now be rewritten, explicitly clarified, and publicized upon request (Bevilacqua, 1976; "Student Consumer Information Services," 1977). The relationship between the institution which had long performed the in loco parentis role, and the student whose rights as a consumer have gradually been recognized through action of the governments and the courts, has been radically altered. This change in relationship will continue in the future becoming more of a contractual relationship which will be supported by student unionization (Shark, 1973).

The consumerism movement in connection with the changing student and financial constraints will affect student affairs and its activities substantially. Articulation of consumer information and implementation of policies to enforce the legal relationship between student and institution will fall on personnel of student affairs. The deans or

vice-presidents, along with administrative members of their staffs, may gradually assume the role of ombudsmen functioning as arbiters on behalf of valid student interests in opposition to faculty or administrators (Mayhew, 1974, p. 23; Penny, 1972, p. 85).

Outside of certain professional roles regarding physical and psychological health, a reduced staff of student affairs practitioners will become more closely aligned with administration, most of today's specialists becoming generalists (Bucci, 1977; Harvey, 1975). The generalists will staff a centralized technical information center in which the staff will become involved with students in a secondary relationship, becoming facilitators and consultants teaching students how to become peer group counselors and student activity organizers (Bevilacqua, 1976; Hurst & Ivey, 1971). The technical information center will house a student operated resource center to deal with non-technical and non-legal student concerns (Mussano, 1976). Student affairs administrators and officers will become "scholarly-practitioners" (Harvey, 1976), and will survive the merge with administration only if they are equipped with technical skills such as organization, planning, budgeting, conflict resolution (Harvey, 1976), marketing, and the economic understanding of national labor demands (Hoenack, 1975).

Federal regulations mandating more effective career counseling and vocational choice guidance for students will require a substantial investment of student affairs time in the collection and dissemination of accurate information in a rapidly changing job market. National employment trends and the emergence of new occupations, the salary ranges, the required skills and their relationship with courses offered

will be stressed (Heist, 1975, pp. 105-106; Simmons, 1973). Cooperation with faculty for the necessary education and reeducation of all those involved in career counseling and occupational aptitude evaluation will be the responsibility of student affairs (Hoenack, 1975). Student career counseling will not consist of having information available when requested by students but will be emphasized throughout the four years of undergraduate education (Simmons, 1973).

#### Summary of Predictions of Contemporary Educational Writers

The preceding sections have been a review of the literature regarding the effects of selected social, governmental, and financial trends on the student affairs sector of postsecondary education. Briefly, some contemporary educational writers have predicted that tomorrow's college students will become fewer in number, be older, inclined to attend college courses on a part-time, commuter basis, and desire more voice in where and what courses will be taught and what will be the services offered. The changing student will gradually come to view postsecondary education as a service, to be purchased as any other service, and will increasingly demand his or her rights, as a consumer, to select courses and services that would be beneficial to them.

Writers suggested that as postsecondary education becomes increasingly expensive and the traditional full-time, 18 to 21 year old student declines in number, tuition paid by the student will also decline; with fewer student hours, the state funding allocation will also decline, affecting all institutional programs and services. Governments, both state and federal, in an effort to reduce the public cost

of public postsecondary education, will gradually assume more control of institutions and specify which programs and services are to be offered on a cost benefit analysis.

Lest the predictions made by educational writers be viewed with "doomsday" alarm, some considerations should be pointed out. Attention should be given to the fact that the preceding predictions have evolved from today's trends as perceived by educational writers. As predictions they cannot be accepted as fact. Secondly, the predictions made range over the next decade or so. Many as yet unknown events may occur which could alter the trends substantially.

Consideration should also be given to the fact that many educational writers suggested, as did Miller and Prince (1976, pp. 3-5), that the development of the whole student is the mission and task of the whole college and many non-curricular services will continue to be essential to this mission. Effective performance of institutional missions during the 1980s, and beyond, will require that colleges and universities provide an adequate and well thought out program of student services if their students--confronted with the increasing pressures of an urban, industrialized society--are to become emancipated, self-sustaining, and informed individuals (Dressel, 1973).



### CHAPTER III

#### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship of institutional size, institutional type, and institutional permanency with resistance to future change in the student affairs sector of public postsecondary institutions as perceived by student affairs practitioners. This chapter is addressed to the research hypotheses derived from theoretical concepts, the research design employed to test the hypotheses, development of the research instrument, selection of the sample, and steps taken in collection and treatment of the research data.

#### Research Hypotheses

The research undertaken is concerned with the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no difference in resistance to future change, as perceived by student affairs practitioners in postsecondary educational institutions, between institutions which have a student population of over 20,000 and institutions with a student population of under 7,000.
2. There is no difference in resistance to future change, as perceived by student affairs practitioners in postsecondary institutions, between institutions which have been in operation 50 years and longer and institutions which have been in operation 20 years and less.

3. There is no difference in resistance to future change, as perceived by student affairs practitioners in postsecondary institutions, between universities and community colleges.

All hypotheses are tested at the .05 level of significance.

### Research Design

In order to test the preceding hypotheses the research technique of a comparative survey was utilized. Eight public postsecondary institutions from the State of Florida, which met the stated criteria on size of institution, type of institution, and permanency of institution were selected for the study. No variables were manipulated and the research component was limited to data collection.

For evaluation of the data, factor analysis of variance was selected with three dimensions representing the variables of size, type, and permanency. As each dimension has two levels, the research design can be characterized as a  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  design which ideally allows analysis of overall differences between the two levels of each dimension (main effects), and second, analysis of combinations of size, type, and permanency to locate unique effects (interaction).

No public universities or community colleges exist in Florida which are both small and old that fit within the stated criteria. Thus, a  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  research design with a total of eight cells left blank two cells. Consultation with the Center for Instructional and Research Computing Activities (CIRCA), University of Florida, resulted in the selection of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), analysis of variance (ANOVA) program which is capable of computing non-orthogonal data and empty cells (Nie, H. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins,

J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H., 1975, p. 392). After trial computer runs on all possible ANOVA subprograms, the SPSS H subprogram for non-orthogonal data with empty cells utilizing the classical approach was selected as the most accurate program for this study (Holzer, Note 3). The selected program computes variance of the main effects of size, type, and permanency, and a two-way interaction of type by size and type by permanency. Interaction of size by permanency was not obtainable due to the two empty cells which constitutes a limitation in the research.

### Research Instrument

A review of available instruments disclosed that no instrument existed by which to measure resistance to future change among institutions varied in size, type, and permanency, and no instrument existed to measure resistance to future change of the student affairs sector of postsecondary institutions. Therefore the instrument for measuring both of the above was developed by the researcher.

A thorough review of the literature was conducted which focused upon predicted changes in student affairs derived from the selected present trends of changing student profiles and values, increased state and federal control, financial constraints, increased demands for accountability, and the consumerism movement. From the literature review, 32 predictions of change in student affairs were abstracted, each prediction supported by two or more sources. The 32 predictions were translated into statements and randomly arrayed in a five value, Likert scale (see Appendix B).

A pilot study of the scale was conducted, composed of five graduate students from the department of educational administration, six graduate students from the department of counselor education, and three professors of education. The purpose of the pilot study was to clarify and correct ambiguities in the instructions to the instrument and in each of the 32 items.

#### Reliability of the Instrument

A correlation matrix procedure was established which correlated the cumulative respondent score of each statement with the total score of all items. As a result of the findings, six statements were eliminated from the instrument. As the six statements demonstrated a high degree of congruence among institutions they will be reported in a separate section in Chapter IV.

A split-half correlation of the remaining 26 items yielded a reliability correlation of .90, utilizing a formula of the Spearman-Brown procedure which provides an estimate of the maximum reliability to be expected if the instrument were doubled in length (Fox, 1969, pp. 362-363).

#### Validity of the Instrument

Instrumental validity, defined as the extent to which the process actually measures what it seeks to measure (Fox, 1969, p. 367), is discussed on two levels for this research. The first level is the utilization of predicted future changes by which to measure resistance to change. The second level is the item choice of predicted changes selected for the instrument from the total array of changes which could occur.

The rationale underlying utilization of predicted changes for the measurement of resistance to change is based on the phenomena of resistance to change proposed by theorists. Resistance phenomena are protective functions derived from the arousal of anxiety (Johnson, 1969; Willower, 1963; Zander, 1964, p. 543). A threat of perceived change from the status quo will result in arousal of anxiety (Zaltman et al., 1977, p. 30). Theoretically, therefore, resistance to change phenomena in student affairs practitioners should be aroused by predictions of major changes in the student affairs sector of post-secondary institutions. As institutions themselves cannot be measured for resistance phenomena, it is through the perceptions of student affairs practitioners, inculcated with the shared values, action patterns, and beliefs of institutional members (Cartwright, 1951; Esman, 1972 p. 69) that resistance or acceptance of future change may be measured.

The choice of items selected for inclusion in the instrument was confined to predictions made by educational writers based upon their knowledge and assumptions about future expectations. As knowledge of future events becomes more certain over time, the validity of each prediction in the instrument as the probable outcome among the total array of possible outcomes would become more certain, but, given the extent of present knowledge, the statements selected for the instrument are not of themselves valid. Validity of item choice rests, then, not on the actual content of each item, but on the source, knowledgeable educational writers, who have logically predicted outcomes of present trends in student affairs of postsecondary institutions.

The researcher-developed instrument has no outside criterion by which validity of the instrument, or its content, can be established.

The instrument itself and the items which make up the instrument can be said to have face validity in measurement of resistance to future change in student affairs given that (1) resistance to future change, theoretically, can be made to occur by arousing anxiety; (2) the respondent sample selected were student affairs practitioners with administrative responsibilities; and (3) the items selected for the instrument were limited by a broad array of predictions of change in the spectrum of student affairs as made by supposedly knowledgeable educational writers.

#### Research Sample

The State of Florida has two distinct systems of public post-secondary education consisting of nine universities and 28 community colleges. Demographic data regarding student populations and approximate dates that each institution began operations were collected. The two systems were sub-classified by size to fit the criterion of student populations of over 20,000 and under 7,000. As most of the state universities and community colleges reflect the recent growth of the state, only one community college and one university were selected which had been in operation 50 years or more. When a sub-classification contained several institutions which fit the criteria for population size and beginning of operation, the institutions selected for study were selected to represent regions of the state as equally as possible. Eight institutions were finally selected: four universities and four community colleges; two universities and two community colleges with student populations over 20,000, two universities and two community

colleges with student populations under 7,000; one university and one community college which have been in operation 50 years or longer, three universities and three community colleges which have been in operation 20 years or less.

### Data Collection Procedures

A letter was mailed to the deans or vice-presidents of the student affairs sector explaining the research project and requesting their cooperation (see Appendix A). Five working days later each dean or vice-president was contacted by telephone to obtain their consent to cooperate with the research project. Each was asked to estimate the number of student affairs practitioners in their respective institutions who had administrative program or activity responsibility. Within two working days each dean or vice-president was mailed the suggested number of research instruments and a stamped, self-addressed envelope for return mail. For data control, each packet was coded by institution and consecutively numbered. A total of 96 packets was mailed to the eight institutions. The deans or vice-presidents returned 71, or 74% of the packets to the researcher. Follow up telephone conversations with the deans or vice-presidents indicated that either the number of student affairs practitioners with administrative responsibilities had been over-estimated or the instruments, dispersed by the deans or vice-presidents, had not been returned to the central student affairs office of the institution. The type of research under study (1) was exploratory in concept; (2) was not compatible with the requirements of randomization in variable controlled research; and (3) did not require

that the total population of student affairs practitioners in each institution be measured. The percentage of instruments returned was considered a sample of student affairs perceptions sufficient for analysis.

#### Data Treatment Procedure

The returned instruments were coded numerically. All information was transcribed onto data recording forms. Transcription was varified by an outside observer. The data were then key punched on computer cards and verified. A program was designed utilizing the SPSS H package commanding computer output of (1) an instrument statement correlation matrix; (2) data frequency tabulations; (3) means and standard deviations of the total data by research category; and (4) an analysis of variance of each of the 32 items.



## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship of institutional size, institutional type, and institutional permanency with resistance to future change in student affairs as perceived by student affairs practitioners in public postsecondary institutions in Florida. As described in the previous chapter, eight institutions were selected which matched established criteria in type, size, and permanency. An instrument to measure resistance to future change in student affairs was developed from predictions of change made by contemporary educational writers.

The statistical results are presented in this chapter in two sections. The first section presents institutional and research category data. The second section presents an analysis of each of the 26 instrument statements which were statistically determined as reliable in measuring resistance to future change. Similar analyses of the six statements of the instrument eliminated by a correlation matrix as unreliable are presented in Appendix C.

#### Institutional and Research Category Data

Four universities and four community colleges in Florida were selected for research. A total of 71 student affairs practitioners with administrative responsibilities completed the instrument. All response scores on the 26 statements ranged from 59 to 121. The mean of all responses was 89.7; the standard deviation was 14.22

Table 1 displays the institutions selected by size, type, and permanency, the number of student affairs practitioners who responded to the instrument in each category, and percentage of responses each institution contributed to the total sample. The mean and standard deviation of total responses of student affairs practitioners by research categories are presented in Table 2. Table 3 presents the average mean of student affairs practitioner responses by the two levels of type, size, and permanency of institutions.

TABLE 1  
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONER RESPONSES BY INSTITUTION

Type	Size	Permanency	Total Responses	% of Total
Universities	(1) Large	New	8	11.3
	(2) Small	New	16	22.5
	(1) Large	Old	18	25.2
Community Colleges	(1) Large	New	10	14.1
	(2) Small	New	13	18.4
	(1) Large	Old	8	8.5
	8		71	100.0

TABLE 2  
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONER RESPONSES BY CATEGORY OF TYPE, SIZE, AND PERMANENCY

	Universities			Community Colleges		
	Small	Large		Small	Large	
	New	New	Old	New	New	Old
$\bar{X}$	80.44	100.75	94.33	92.15	86.20	86.33
SD	12.28	9.13	10.61	16.64	11.75	19.15

TABLE 3  
AVERAGE MEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONER RESPONSES  
BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE, SIZE, AND PERMANENCY

	<u>Institution Type</u>	<u>Institution Size</u>	<u>Institution Permanency</u>
$\bar{X}$	Universities = 91.84	Large = 91.9	Old = 90.33
$\bar{X}$	Community Colleges = 88.23	Small = 86.3	New = 87.33

#### Analyses of Instrument Statements

This section contains the results of analysis of each of the 26 statistically reliable statements of the instrument. One table composed of three parts is presented for each statement. The first part of each table presents the frequency of response of all student affairs practitioners for the five instrument values, and the statement statistical mean and standard deviation. The second part presents the statistical mean of student affairs practitioner responses by the categories of institutional type, size, and permanency. The third part presents the results of analysis of variance of the main effects of type, size, and permanency and the interactions of type by size and type by permanency. F scores which are critical at the .05 level of significance are identified. Each table is concluded with an evaluation of hypotheses. A discussion of results follows the 26 statement analyses.

TABLE 4

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: THE INCREASING SURPLUS OF FACULTY MEMBERS WILL BE RETRAINED TO GRADUALLY REPLACE STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>
(1) Strongly support	2
(2) Moderately support	12
(3) Neither support nor resist	18
(4) Moderately resist	21
(5) Strongly resist	18

Mean all institutions: 3.58  
Standard Deviation: 1.12

<u>Category Means</u>					
<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.0	4.25	3.78	4.08	3.10	3.38

<u>Analysis of Variance</u>			
<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3	0.165	0.145
Type	1	0.023	0.021
Size	1	0.004	0.981
Permanency	1		
Two-way interactions:	2	13.608	11.991*
Type X Size	1	1.113	0.981
Type X Permanency	1		

\*Significant at the .05 level.

#### Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between small and large institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted. However, when type and size of institutions interact, large universities were found to be more resistant.

TABLE 5

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF  
SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: AS EDUCATIONAL COSTS  
RISE, INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES, SUCH AS HEALTH SERVICES, PSYCHOLOGICAL  
TESTING, CHILD CARE CENTERS, AND STUDENT ENTERTAINMENT, WILL BE PLACED  
ON A PAY-AS-YOU-GO, FULL COST, STUDENT OPTION BASIS

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	6	
(2) Moderately support	28	Mean all institutions: 2.95
(3) Neither support nor resist	8	Standard Deviation: 1.12
(4) Moderately resist	21	
(5) Strongly resist	8	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.13	2.50	3.67	3.15	3.30	2.67

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	2.569	2.065
Size	1	1.096	0.881
Permanency	1	3.428	2.755
Two Way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.114	0.116
Type X Permanency	1	7.245	5.823*

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change among types of institutions, large and small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted. However, when type and permanency interact, old universities were found to be more resistant.

TABLE 6

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: THE SCOPE AND DEGREE OF NON-ACADEMIC SERVICES PROVIDED STUDENTS IN ALL STATE CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS WILL BE MANDATED BY LEGISLATIVE AND GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	4	
(2) Moderately support	7	Mean all institutions: 3.75
(3) Neither support nor resist	17	Standard Deviation: 1.2
(4) Moderately resist	18	
(5) Strongly resist	25	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.31	4.50	3.72	3.62	4.40	3.17

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.037	0.028
Size	1	11.048	8.220*
Permanency	1	7.445	5.539*
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.445	0.331
Type X Permanency	1	0.464	0.345

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between size of institutions and between permanency of institutions were rejected. Large institutions and new institutions were found to be more resistant. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions was accepted.

TABLE 7

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS, BECAUSE OF CHANGING STUDENT DEMANDS, WILL PRIMARILY ASSUME THE ROLE OF OMBUDSMAN

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 70</u>	
(1) Strongly support	4	
(2) Moderately support	14	Mean all institutions: 3.24
(3) Neither support nor resist	21	Standard Deviation: 1.08
(4) Moderately resist	23	
(5) Strongly resist	8	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.80	4.13	3.72	3.23	2.80	2.50

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	4.424	4.545*
Size	1	2.081	2.138
Permanency		0.172	0.117
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	8.364	8.593*
Type X Permanency	1	0.024	0.024

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions was rejected. Universities were found to be more resistant than community colleges. When types of institutions interact with size, large universities were found to be more resistant. The null hypothesis of no difference between old and new institutions was accepted.

TABLE 8

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE STUDENT TO THE INSTITUTION WILL EVENTUALLY RESEMBLE THAT OF CITIZEN TO "PUBLIC UTILITY" COMPANY; THUS, MANY OF THE EXTRA-CURRICULAR SERVICES OFFERED BY STUDENT AFFAIRS WILL BE ELIMINATED

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	1	
(2) Moderately support	10	Mean all institutions: 3.87
(3) Neither support nor resist	7	Standard Deviation: 1.04
(4) Moderately resist	32	
(5) Strongly resist	21	

<u>Category Means</u>					
<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.19	4.75	4.22	3.92	4.00	3.17

<u>Analysis of Variance</u>			
Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.489	0.560
Size	1	7.679	8.786*
Permanency	1	1.780	2.037
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1		6.930*
Type X Permanency	1		0.239

\*Significant at the .05 level.

#### Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between large and small institutions was rejected. Large institutions were found to be more resistant than small institutions. As large institutions interact with types, large universities were found to be more resistant. The null hypothesis of no difference between old and new institutions was accepted.



TABLE 9

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS BUDGETS WILL BE SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED DUE TO DECLINING ENROLLMENTS, REDUCTION OF POPULAR SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION, DECREASED TAX SUPPORT, AND REDUCED FEDERAL ALLOCATION OF CATEGORICAL GRANTS

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses of all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	3	
(2) Moderately support	8	Mean all institutions: 3.73
(3) Neither support nor resist	14	Standard Deviation: 1.12
(4) Moderately resist	26	
(5) Strongly resist	20	

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Category Means</u>					
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.25	4.38	3.53	3.85	4.00	3.17

<u>Analysis of Variance</u>			
Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.009	0.008
Size	1	4.685	3.909
Permanency	1	2.499	2.085
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	2.588	2.159
Type X Permanency	1	0.190	0.159

### Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large and small institutions, and between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 10

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: PART-TIME STAFF IN STUDENT AFFAIRS POSITIONS WILL INCREASE, REPLACING FULL TIME STAFF

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	1	
(2) Moderately support	20	Mean all institutions: 3.50
(3) Neither support nor resist	10	Standard Deviation: 1.19
(4) Moderately resist	22	
(5) Strongly resist	18	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.56	4.38	3.28	3.54	3.20	3.33

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	1.642	1.165
Size	1	0.462	0.328
Permanency	1	2.707	1.921
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	3.635	3.580
Type X Permanency	1	3.386	3.403

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large and small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 11

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS WILL NO LONGER BE A SEPARATE ENTITY BUT WILL BE MERGED WITH CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 70</u>	
(1) Strongly support	2	
(2) Moderately support	7	Mean all institutions: 4.04
(3) Neither support nor resist	8	Standard Deviation: 1.10
(4) Moderately resist	22	
(5) Strongly resist	31	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.93	4.88	4.28	4.23	4.60	3.67

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	1.612	1.860
Size	1	14.595	16.842*
Permanency	1	2.425	2.798
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	6.708	7.741*
Type X Permanency	1	0.253	0.292

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between large and small institutions was rejected. Large institutions were found to be more resistant; when type and size interact, large universities were found to be more resistant than large community colleges. The null hypothesis of no difference between old and new institutions was accepted.

TABLE 12

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: VOLUNTEER PARAPROFESSIONALS WILL ASSUME SIGNIFICANT DEGREES OF THERAPEUTIC AND ACADEMIC ADVISING, CAREER DEVELOPMENT, AND STUDENT RECRUITMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Instrument Values	Responses all institutions = 71	
(1) Strongly support	6	
(2) Moderately support	24	Mean all institutions: 3.04
(3) Neither support nor resist	15	Standard Deviation: 1.27
(4) Moderately resist	13	
(5) Strongly resist	13	

Category Means

Universities			Community Colleges		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
2.88	3.75	2.78	2.77	3.50	3.17

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.001	0.001
Size	1	6.778	4.236*
Permanency	1	5.292	3.308
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.057	0.036
Type X Permanency	1	0.913	0.570

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between large and small institutions was rejected; large institutions were found to be more resistant than small institutions. The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance between types of institutions or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 13

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: A PART OF STUDENT ACTIVITY FEES WILL BE INCREASINGLY UTILIZED TO SUPPORT STUDENT UNIONIZATION AND LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 70</u>	
(1) Strongly support	1	
(2) Moderately support	5	Mean all institutions: 4.04
(3) Neither support nor resist	14	Standard Deviation: 1.23
(4) Moderately resist	20	
(5) Strongly resist	30	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.56	4.38	3.83	4.54	4.11	4.33

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	4.157	4.173*
Size	1	0.401	0.402
Permanency	1	0.071	0.171
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	4.093	4.109*
Type X Permanency	1	1.273	1.278

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions was rejected. Community colleges were found to be more resistant. In type and size interaction, small community colleges were found more resistant. The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance between old and new institutions was accepted.

TABLE 14

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: AS CENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION AND STATE BUREAUCRACIES ASSUME GREATER CONTROL AND DEVELOP MORE RIGID REGULATIONS, STUDENT AFFAIRS WILL LOSE ITS FLEXIBILITY IN ADAPTING TO STUDENT NEEDS

---



---

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	0	
(2) Moderately support	5	Mean all institutions: 4.09
(3) Neither support nor resist	10	Standard Deviation: 0.89
(4) Moderately resist	29	
(5) Strongly resist	27	

---

Category Means

Universities			Community Colleges		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
2.69	4.50	4.11	4.31	4.20	4.00

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.424	0.467
Size	1	1.353	0.196
Permanency	1	0.390	0.486
Two way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	2.234	0.092
Type X Permanency	1	0.080	0.752

---

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large and small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 15

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: AS EDUCATION BECOMES MORE OF A CONTRACTUAL BETWEEN SELLERS OF ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC SERVICES AND THE BUYER, ONLY THOSE STAFF AND SERVICES WILL SURVIVE FOR WHICH THE STUDENT WILL PAY

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	3	
(2) Moderately support	12	Mean all institutions: 3.73
(3) Neither support nor resist	6	Standard Deviation: 1.17
(4) Moderately resist	30	
(5) Strongly resist	20	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.06	4.13	4.06	3.85	3.40	4.33

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.826	0.653
Size	1	0.890	0.704
Permanency	1	2.162	1.710
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	6.246	4.940*
Type X Permanency	1	2.248	1.778

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

Although the null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types, sizes, or permanency of institutions were accepted individually, the interaction between type and size indicate that large universities were found more resistant.

TABLE 16

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: INFORMATIONAL NEEDS OF STUDENTS WILL BE MET THROUGH A STUDENT OPERATED, STUDENT RESOURCE CENTER, IN A CENTRALIZED LOCATION, REPLACING THE MANY PROFESSIONAL STAFF WHO NOW PROVIDE INFORMATION TODAY

<u>Instrument Values</u>		<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support		4	
(2) Moderately support		15	Mean all institutions: 3.30
(3) Neither support nor resist		17	Standard Deviation: 1.11
(4) Moderately resist		26	
(5) Strongly resist		9	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.50	3.63	3.28	3.38	2.50	3.50

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	1.196	0.278
Size	1	1.599	0.213
Permanency	1	0.470	0.496
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	2.314	0.133
Type X Permanency	1	3.358	0.071

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between small and large institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.



TABLE 17

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: AS STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF INCREASINGLY BECOME MEMBERS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNITS THE FLEXIBILITY THAT STUDENT AFFAIRS NEEDS TO ADAPT TO THE CHANGING NEEDS OF STUDENTS WILL BE REDUCED

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 70</u>	
(1) Strongly support	1	
(2) Moderately support	5	Mean all institutions: 3.80
(3) Neither support nor resist	16	Standard Deviation: 0.91
(4) Moderately resist	33	
(5) Strongly resist	15	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.63	3.63	3.94	4.00	3.30	4.50

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.833	1.062
Size	1	1.487	1.897
Permanency	1	4.875	6.218*
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	1.131	1.686
Type X Permanency	1	1.734	2.212

\*Significant at the .05 level

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions and between large and small institutions were accepted. The null hypothesis of resistance between old and new institutions was rejected. Old institutions were found to be more resistant.

TABLE 18

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS PROGRAMS AND STAFF WILL BECOME INCREASINGLY DEPENDENT UPON STUDENT ACTIVITY FEES AS OPPOSED TO GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT OR STATE REVENUES

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	5	
(2) Moderately support	7	Mean all institutions: 3.86
(3) Neither support nor resist	9	Standard Deviation: 1.25
(4) Moderately resist	22	
(5) Strongly resist	28	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.88	4.50	4.11	4.15	4.10	3.83

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	2.343	1.751
Size	1	6.853	5.123*
Permanency	1	0.139	3.104
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	7.734	5.782*
Type X Permanency	1	0.033	0.025

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between size of institutions was rejected. When type and size interact large universities were found to be more resistant. The null hypothesis of resistance to future change between old and new institutions was accepted.

TABLE 19

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS WILL ONLY BECOME INVOLVED WITH STUDENTS IN A SECONDARY RELATIONSHIP, BECOMING FACILITATORS AND CONSULTANTS, TEACHING STUDENTS HOW TO BECOME PEER GROUP COUNSELORS AND STUDENT ACTIVITY ORGANIZERS

<u>Instrument Values</u>		<u>Responses all institutions = 70</u>	
(1) Strongly support		1	
(2) Moderately support		14	Mean all institutions: 3.53
(3) Neither support nor resist		21	Standard Deviation: 1.14
(4) Moderately resist		15	
(5) Strongly resist		19	

<u>Category Means</u>					
<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.40	4.50	3.39	3.54	3.20	3.50

<u>Analysis of Variance</u>			
<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	1.170	0.933
Size	1	1.246	0.994
Permanency	1	1.912	1.526
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	5.614	4.479*
Type X Permanency	1	4.452	3.553

\*Significant at the .05 level.

### Hypotheses Evaluation

Although the null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, large and small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted as each variable was considered alone, interaction between type and size of institutions indicated that large universities are more resistant to change.

TABLE 20

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS WILL BE REQUIRED TO BE ACCOUNTABLE, WITH INCREASINGLY SOPHISTICATED AND TIME CONSUMING PROCESSES, TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND STUDENTS FOR NOT ONLY THE COST OF PROGRAMS BUT ALSO THE NEED AND LEGITIMACY OF PROGRAMS

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	9	
(2) Moderately support	26	Mean all institutions: 2.83
(3) Neither support nor resist	11	Standard Deviation: 1.23
(4) Moderately resist	18	
(5) Strongly resist	7	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.88	2.63	2.83	3.23	2.20	3.17

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.290	0.191
Size	1	4.800	3.156
Permanency	1	3.140	2.065
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	1.673	1.100
Type X Permanency	1	1.286	0.845

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future changes between types of institutions, between small or large institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 21

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: WITH CONTINUING FINANCIAL RESTRAINTS, STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS, DESIGNATED ON ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS AS SUPPORT PERSONNEL WITH NO TENURE RIGHTS, WILL GRADUALLY BE ELIMINATED

Instrument Values	Responses all institutions = 71	
(1) Strongly support	2	
(2) Moderately support	10	Mean all institutions: 3.87
(3) Neither support nor resist	10	Standard Deviation: 1.16
(4) Moderately resist	22	
(5) Strongly resist	27	

#### Category Means

Universities			Community Colleges		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.19	4.63	4.33	4.08	3.60	3.33

#### Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.444	0.385
Size	1	2.615	2.267
Permanency	1	0.005	0.004
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	10.057	8.720*
Type X Permanency	1	0.001	0.001

\*Significant at the .05 level.

#### Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference to resistance to future change between types of institutions, small and large institutions, or old and new institutions as main effects were accepted. However, when types and size of institutions interact, large universities were found to be more resistant.

TABLE 22

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARDS FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES WILL BE EXTERNALLY DETERMINED AND EVALUATED BY A STATE AUDITING STAFF

Instrument Values	Responses all institutions = 71	
(1) Strongly support	1	
(2) Moderately support	9	Mean all institutions: 3.97
(3) Neither support nor resist	9	Standard Deviation: 1.08
(4) Moderately resist	24	
(5) Strongly resist	28	

Category Means

Universities			Community Colleges		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.69	3.75	3.72	4.46	4.40	4.00

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	5.827	5.106*
Size	1	0.002	0.001
Permanency	1	0.179	0.157
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.042	0.037
Type X Permanency	1	0.310	0.271

\*Significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions was rejected; community colleges were found to be more resistant than universities. The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance between small and large institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 23

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: UNIONS OF STUDENTS WILL BE ESTABLISHED TO BALANCE THE POWER OF FACULTY UNIONS, CARRYING ON THEIR OWN NEGOTIATIONS WITH INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIALS OR DIRECTLY WITH TRUSTEES OR THE LEGISLATURE

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	0	
(2) Moderately support	8	Mean all institutions: 3.91
(3) Neither support nor resist	17	Standard Deviation: 1.03
(4) Moderately resist	19	
(5) Strongly resist	27	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.81	4.00	3.78	3.92	3.90	4.50

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.804	0.717
Size	1	0.038	0.034
Permanency	1	0.065	0.058
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.122	0.109
Type X Permanency	1	1.512	1.348

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large or small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 24

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: CAMPUS LIFE AS A "COMMUNITY OF STUDENTS" WILL LARGELY DISAPPEAR AS ACADEMIC COURSES ARE INCREASINGLY TAUGHT IN OFF-CAMPUS SETTINGS ON NIGHTS, WEEK-ENDS, OR SHORT-TERM BLOCK PERIODS

Instrument Values	Responses all institutions = 71	
(1) Strongly support	3	
(2) Moderately support	17	Mean all institutions: 3.24
(3) Neither support nor resist	23	Standard Deviation: 1.13
(4) Moderately resist	16	
(5) Strongly resist	12	

#### Category Means

Universities			Community Colleges		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
2.56	4.13	4.11	3.15	2.40	2.83

#### Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	5.223	6.334*
Size	1	1.764	2.143
Permanency	1	1.975	2.399
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	14.723	17.883*
Type X Permanency	1	0.447	0.523

\*Significant at the .05 level.

#### Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions was rejected; universities were found to be more resistant than community colleges. When type of institution and size interact, large universities were found more resistant. The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance between old and new institutions was accepted.



TABLE 25

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: INSTITUTIONS WILL HAVE DECREASING DECONTROL OVER NON-ACADEMIC SECTORS OF STUDENT LIVES AS EDUCATION BECOMES MORE AND MORE A CONSUMER ACTIVITY

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 70</u>	
(1) Strongly support	5	
(2) Moderately support	16	Mean all institutions: 3.01
(3) Neither support nor resist	29	Standard Deviation: 1.06
(4) Moderately resist	13	
(5) Strongly resist	7	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
2.75	3.63	3.28	2.69	2.80	3.20

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	1.238	1.138
Size	1	2.463	2.263
Permanency	1	0.000	0.001
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	1.616	1.484
Type X Permanency	1	1.162	1.068

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between small or large institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 26

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENTS WILL BE TRAINED TO ASSUME MANY OF THE NON-PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING, INFORMATIONAL, AND SPECIAL PROJECTS ROLES CURRENTLY HELD BY PAID STAFF

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	3	
(2) Moderately support	24	Mean all institutions: 3.17
(3) Neither support nor resist	13	Standard Deviation: 1.18
(4) Moderately resist	20	
(5) Strongly resist	11	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.44	3.50	2.94	3.23	3.00	2.83

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	1.097	0.758
Size	1	0.099	0.068
Permanency	1	1.441	0.996
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.236	0.163
Type X Permanency	1	0.338	0.234

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between old and new institutions, or between large and small institutions were accepted.

TABLE 27

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: FINANCIAL AID WILL EXPAND AND BE TRANSFERRED UNDER THE MANAGEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS OFFICE IN A COOPERATIVE OR JOINT ARRANGEMENT WITH THE ADMISSIONS OFFICE

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 69</u>	
(1) Strongly support	2	
(2) Moderately support	16	Mean all institutions: 3.62
(3) Neither support nor resist	9	Standard Deviation: 1.23
(4) Moderately resist	21	
(5) Strongly resist	21	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
3.53	3.71	3.61	3.38	3.90	3.83

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.034	0.021
Size	1	1.308	0.822
Permanency	1	0.184	0.116
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.289	0.182
Type X Permanency	1	0.003	0.002

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, large and small institutions, or old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 28

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF WITH "SPECIALIST" ROLES WILL DISAPPEAR TO BE REPLACED BY AD-HOC ADMINISTRATOR "GENERALISTS"

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 69</u>	
(1) Strongly support	3	
(2) Moderately support	14	Mean all institutions: 3.42
(3) Neither support nor resist	15	Standard Deviation: 1.13
(4) Moderately resist	25	
(5) Strongly resist	12	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.13	4.14	3.56	3.54	3.20	3.00

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.814	0.642
Size	1	0.912	0.719
Permanency	1	0.574	0.453
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	4.702	3.709
Type X Permanency	1	0.323	0.254

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large and small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 29

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENTS WILL DEMAND A VOTING MEMBERSHIP ON ALL COMMITTEES OF THE INSTITUTION CONCERNED WITH PLANNING OF COURSES AND SERVICES, AND THE EXPENDITURES OF MONIES FOR BOTH

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	11	
(2) Moderately support	23	Mean all institutions: 2.73
(3) Neither support nor resist	15	Standard Deviation: 1.17
(4) Moderately resist	18	
(5) Strongly resist	4	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.06	2.63	3.06	2.38	2.40	2.33

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	5.152	3.781
Size	1	0.432	0.317
Permanency	1	0.397	0.291
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.563	0.413
Type X Permanency	1	0.553	0.406

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large and small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

### Discussion of Significant Differences by Category

Of the 26 reliable statements in the instrument, 16 were found to reflect differences in resistance to future change between sizes of institutions, between types of institutions, between permanency of institutions, or between interaction among the presumed research variables. Eleven of the differences involve large institutions. Of those eleven where size of institution is a factor, nine statements resulted in a difference in resistance to future change when large institutions interacted with universities. Old universities and community colleges were found to be more resistant to future change in one statement and old universities alone on one statement. Community colleges were found more resistant on one statement and small community colleges on one statement. The following sections present an interpretation of the differences by research category as student affairs practitioners perceived their respective institutions would react to the instrument statements.

Large institutions. Large universities and community colleges are likely to be more resistant to change than small institutions in the use of volunteer paraprofessionals assuming significant degrees of therapeutic and academic advising, career development and student recruitment responsibilities (see Table 12.) Large, new universities and large new community colleges are likely to resist the scope and degree of non-academic services of state controlled institutions being mandated by legislative and governmental agencies (see Table 6).

Large universities. Student affairs practitioners of large universities perceive their institutions as more likely to be more

resistant than other institutions in retraining the increasing surplus of faculty members to gradually replace student affairs practitioners (see Table 4). They also perceive their institution as likely to resist student affairs practitioners assuming primarily the role of ombudsman because of changing student demands (see Table 7). Large universities would likely be more resistant than other institutions to the elimination of extra-curricular services to students as the student relationship to the institution eventually comes to resemble that of citizen to a "public utility" company (see Table 8). Student affairs practitioners of large universities feel their institutions would resist the merging of student affairs with central administration (see Table 11), and would resist student affairs programs and staff becoming increasingly dependent upon student activity fees as opposed to general institutional support or state revenues (see Table 18). Student affairs practitioners of large universities feel that their institutions would likely resist campus life as a "community of students" largely disappearing as academic courses would be taught in off-campus settings on nights, weekends, or short term block periods (see Table 24) or that student affairs practitioners would become involved with students in a secondary relationship as facilitators or consultants, teaching students how to become peer group counselors and student activity organizers (see Table 19). Student affairs practitioners of large universities feel their institutions, even with continuing financial restraints, would resist elimination of student affairs positions although the positions have no tenure rights and student affairs personnel are designated as support personnel (see Table 21); neither do they believe their large universities would accept the survival of only those staff and services for which students will pay (see Table 15).

Old universities. Student affairs practitioners of old universities feel their institutions would be inclined to resist the placing of institutional services, such as health services, psychological testing, child care centers, and student entertainment on a pay-as-you-go, full cost, student option basis (see Table 5).

Community colleges. Student affairs practitioners in community colleges feel their institutions are likely to resist the intervention of a state auditing staff to determine and evaluate student affairs programs and activities by a standard for accountability (see Table 22). Community colleges, especially small community colleges, are considered by student affairs practitioners as likely to resist the utilization of a part of student activity fees to support unionization and lobbying fees for students (see Table 13).

#### Resistance to Future Change by All Institutions

Two statements in which student affairs practitioners of all institutions feel their institutions would resist are of note. According to practitioners, it is likely that all institutions would moderately resist the establishment of unions of students to carry on their own negotiations with institutional officials or directly with trustees or the legislature (see Table 23). Student affairs practitioners feel it is likely that all institutions would moderately to strongly resist losing their flexibility in adapting to student needs as centralized administration and state bureaucracies assume greater control and develop more rigid regulations (see Table 14).



### Acceptance of Future Change by All Institutions

Three of the instrument statements found in Appendix C, eliminated by correlation matrix as unreliable in measuring resistance to change are of note. Student affairs practitioners of all institutions feel their institutions are likely to moderately support expansion of occupation related counseling, such as career and vocational guidance and occupational aptitude evaluation of individual students (see Table 34). All student affairs practitioners feel their institutions would moderately support cooperating with faculty in providing knowledge of job market need in relationship to course content (see Table 31). All student affairs practitioners feel that their institutions would moderately support the need for student affairs practitioners to become "scholarly practitioners" with theoretical and practical background in technical skills (see Table 32).

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the preceding chapters the matter of prevailing social, financial, and governmental trends as they may foster and promote change in postsecondary educational institutions, and the levels of resistance these changes may encounter from the institutions, have been examined. The question was raised of whether resistance to change would be equal across all postsecondary institutions or whether institutions with different characteristics would display different levels of resistance.

Three distinguishing characteristics, institutional size, institutional type, and institutional permanency were selected as presumed variables to be studied. Theorists and educational writers have proposed that (1) larger institutions are more bureaucratic and therefore more inflexible; (2) older institutions become more rigid over time and, therefore, more resistant; and (3) community colleges are more innovative and, because relatively new, have suffered less from ossification than four-year institutions. Definitions of institutional size were established limiting institutions to be studied to those with a student population of over 20,000 and those with a student population of under 7,000. The definitions for institutional permanency were limited to institutions in operation over 50 years and institutions in operation 20 years or less. Four universities and four community colleges, as types of institutions, were selected which fit the established criteria for size and permanency. As the research was exploratory in nature, research was limited to institutions in Florida.

As institutional attitudes toward resistance to, or acceptance of, future change can only be obtained through personnel of the institution, the decision was made to confine research to the student affairs sector of postsecondary institutions and student affairs practitioners with some administrative responsibilities as the research population.

The literature was reviewed for predictions of change made by temporary educational writers in the student affairs sector of postsecondary education. Thirty-two statements were abstracted from the literature. A five value, Likert scale was developed for measurement of resistance or acceptance of future change (see Appendix B).

Permission was obtained from the deans or vice-presidents in the eight selected institutions to conduct research in their institutions. The appropriate number of instruments, as suggested by the deans and vice-presidents, was mailed to each institution. The number of student affairs practitioners with some administrative responsibilities who completed and returned the instrument was 71.

Instrument reliability was determined through a computer performed correlation matrix, correlating each statement score with the total score of all statements. Six statements, found to have low correlation for measurement of resistance to change, were excluded from the instrument. A split-half correlation of the remaining 26 statements of the instrument, doubled by the Spearman-Brown formula to the actual length of the instrument, yielded a reliability quotient of .90.

Raw data were programmed utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences analysis of variance, factorial design H, the classical approach, which has the computational ability of accommodating empty cells and non-orthogonal cell frequencies. Main effects of type

of institution, size of institution, and permanency of institution; and two-way interaction of type by size and type by permanency were computed. Because of two empty cells representing the lack of small, old universities and community colleges in Florida, interaction of size by permanency could not be calculated.

Each of the original 32 statements was analyzed for differences between and among the research categories of size of institutions, type of institutions, and permanency of institutions at the .05 level of significance. The 26 statements determined as reliable were presented in the preceding chapter. The six remaining statements, which displayed institutional acceptance as perceived by student affairs practitioners, are found in Appendix C.

#### Research Summary

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change in student affairs, as perceived by student affairs practitioners, between universities and community colleges was confirmed in 22 statements and rejected in four statements. Of those four statements, universities were perceived to be more resistant in three statements and community colleges in one statement. Considering the array of 26 statements of which only four statements indicated a difference, it is possible the differences were by chance. Therefore, it might be concluded that student affairs practitioners in universities do not perceive their institutions as being more resistant to future change than student affairs practitioners in community colleges when types of institutions are considered alone.

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change, as perceived by student affairs practitioners, between large institutions and small institutions was confirmed in 21 statements and rejected in five statements. In the five statements in which a difference was found, large institutions were perceived to be more resistant than small institutions.

When the joint effects of type of institution and size of institution were considered, sufficient evidence was present to suggest that a relationship may exist between large universities and resistance to change. In ten of the 26 instrument statements, large universities were perceived to be more resistant to future change than perceived in other research categories or combinations of categories. The ratio of ten statements in which a difference was found to the total of 26 statements indicated a higher number of differences than a chance finding.

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between old universities and community colleges and new universities and community colleges, as perceived by student affairs practitioners, was confirmed in 23 statements and rejected in three statements. In interaction between the categories of type and permanency, only one difference was found. The overall confirmation of the hypothesis of no difference between old and new institutions may be genuine. An examination of the average mean of student affairs practitioner responses between old institutions and new institutions (see Table 3) displayed a small 2.5 variance. The finding may also reflect the absence of data in two cells.

The major evidence in differences between levels and among research categories, then, was the suggestion that large universities were found to be more resistant to future change as perceived by student affairs practitioners. Was any difference to be found between old, large universities and new, large universities? Observation of the means in part two of the instrument statements revealed that, in 22 of the 26 instrument statements, student affairs practitioners of new, large universities perceived their institutions as more resistant to future change than their counterparts in old, large universities. A small sample Student's  $t$  statistic comparing the means between new, large universities and old, large universities yielded a  $t$  score of 2.094, significant at the .05 level. Student affairs practitioners of new, large universities perceived their institutions as more resistant to future change than old, large universities.

### Conclusions

Educators have long expressed the need for research on the organizational features and social dynamics of educational institutions. Yet, little effort has been expended at the macro-institutional level while great effort has been directed toward the micro-small-group level. Concomitantly, great effort has been directed toward research in change innovation, diffusion, and adoption of change but little effort has been devoted to resistance to change in educational institutions. Studies of resistance to change that are available are limited to small groups or in industrial and military fields. Few studies were found through computer search of resistance to change involving

faculty; no studies were found concerning resistance to change in administration of student affairs. This study was an effort to contribute to the body of knowledge regarding institutional behavior when faced with change, particularly resistance which may be generated by the student affairs sector of public postsecondary institutions, through the perceptions of student affairs practitioners.

Although the research conducted did not conclusively confirm a difference in resistance to future change between universities and community colleges, between large and small institutions, or between new and old institutions, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that in a combination of institutional type and size, large universities may be more resistant to future change in student affairs as perceived by student affairs practitioners. Moreover, the Student's t test comparing new, large universities and old, large universities revealed that new large universities are more resistant.

The findings of this study support the theoretical positions of Ivor Morrish and Robert Presthus that large educational institutions, excluding the community college segment of postsecondary education, are more resistant to change because of institutional mass and the departmentalized bureaucratic structure maintained by large institutions. This study also supports the concept of the innovative, creative, and essentially fluid attitude toward educational purpose that has been the rallying hallmark of the community college movement, a movement which was conceived and has thrived in an atmosphere of ongoing change.

This study does not support the propositions of Richard Miller and Kurt Lewin which imply that old institutions are more resistant

to change. However, historical factors in the development of the university system in Florida may have unique effects acting upon this research. Relatively recent and rapid increase in the population of the State of Florida gave impetus to the creation of six new universities between 1955 and 1965. The difficulties normally associated with the establishment of a new postsecondary institution, combined with the rapid expansion in student population of some of these new institutions during the period of social unrest which characterized the decade between the late 1960s and early 1970s may partially explain the higher resistance to future change exhibited by student affairs practitioners of new, large universities. A concomitant factor may have been the desire to gain the status, success, and approbation of the three long established Florida universities. New, large universities perhaps perceive themselves, and by extension their institutions, as having recently passed through a period of many adjustments. Perception of still further change may be anathema and student affairs practitioners in long established universities with a large, stable population of students, although moderately resistant to further change, did not perceive their institutions responding to future change with the same degree of threat.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

As has been noted, research on the characteristics and internal dynamics of postsecondary institutions has long been neglected. Little research involving resistance to change in most sectors of campus life has apparently been done. It is non-existent in the student affairs field. Thus the possibilities for further research are extensive.



Before definitive meaning can be ascribed to the results of this study regarding the relationship of the institutional characteristics of type, size, and length of time in existence with resistance to future change as perceived by student affairs practitioners, further research is recommended, particularly in three directions: (1) attitudes of student affairs practitioners in other states, (2) correlations of resistance with other institutional characteristics and institutional sectors, and (3) additional measurements of resistance to future change by other modes and types of instruments.

This study was limited to the university and community college systems of postsecondary education in one state. As such, the research findings may be of interest to Florida student affairs practitioners, institutional administrators, or state agencies involved in some way with change but there is no evidence that the results of this study would apply to other state systems. Postsecondary education is a unique creature of each state. Additionally, each state has varying degrees of state control and population growth. As example, would resistance to change be found in a rigorously controlled state with a relatively stable population such as New York? Would resistance to change be present in postsecondary institutions of thinly populated Western states? As state postsecondary systems are unique, patterns of resistance may also be unique.

The institutional characteristics of size, type, and permanency were the focus of this study. Other institutional characteristics might strongly affect acceptance or resistance to change. Institutions with an essentially broad decision making apparatus may be different in resistance to future change than institutions in which decisions are

made by a limited number of individuals. Strong leadership, as opposed to weak, might increase or decrease resistance to change.

Results of this study indicated that the strongest resistance to future change may be encountered within large universities. Large institutions are usually compartmentalized. A fruitful area of research might be a study correlating attitudes of resistance among other segments of institutions, such as faculty, students, departments, and/or top administrators in a single institution.

Although the researcher developed instrument has a logical reasoning underlying the content of the instrument, dynamics of respondent attitudes, in favor or opposed to any given subject matter, are complex and not completely understood. Correlations of two or more approaches to measurement of resistance to future change might add to knowledge of the resistance to change phenomena in postsecondary institutions.

The social, financial, and governmental trends which generated this research may have far reaching effects upon postsecondary institutions in the near future. If any, or all, of the trends accelerate, postsecondary institutions could be bombarded with the necessity for change. Opportunities for research in future change would be bountiful and widespread.

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER REQUESTING COOPERATION FOR RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
GAINESVILLE, 32611

VICE PRESIDENT FOR  
STUDENT AFFAIRS

123 TIGERT HALL  
904/392-1265

November 15, 1978

Dear

A research study regarding the effects of future trends on the student affairs sector of post-secondary institutions is being conducted as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education at the University of Florida. It has the support of the Institute for Higher Education and the office of Student Affairs.

Your institution has been selected as fitting the criteria of size, type, and length of time in existence for this study. The purpose of this letter is to request your participation and that of your staff members in the student affairs division who have significant administrative responsibility.

About 15 to 20 minutes will be required by each participant to fill out a short demographic data sheet and a 32 item check list questionnaire regarding the future of student affairs. Both the demographic data and questionnaire will be anonymous and all answers will be held in complete confidence.

During the next week you will be contacted by telephone to seek your approval for participation in this study and to get the number of student affairs staff who have significant administrative responsibilities and who are willing to participate in the study. Then the correct number of information packets would be mailed to you shortly after Thanksgiving. Your responsibility will be to distribute them to the appropriate staff members and return them when they have been completed, in the enclosed stamped return envelope to the office indicated, before the Christmas holidays.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. I hope very much that you can participate. I look forward to talking with you on the phone in the next few days.

Sincerely yours,

Joan White  
Graduate Student  
University of Florida

Arthur Sandeen  
Vice President for Student Affairs

## APPENDIX B

### INSTITUTIONAL ACCEPTANCE/RESISTANCE TO CHANGE SCALE

## INSTITUTIONAL ACCEPTANCE/RESISTANCE TO CHANGE SCALE

Contemporary educational writers have predicted numerous changes will occur in student affairs in the coming years. ASSUME THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS WILL TAKE PLACE. REGARDLESS OF YOUR PERSONAL OPINION, please place an (X) in the space which you feel would best reflect the reaction of YOUR INSTITUTION.

- (1) MY INSTITUTION would strongly support and easily adapt to the change.
- (2) MY INSTITUTION would moderately support and adapt to the change.
- (3) MY INSTITUTION would neither support nor resist the change.
- (4) MY INSTITUTION would moderately resist the change.
- (5) MY INSTITUTION would strongly resist the change.

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

1. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )      The increasing surplus of faculty members will be retrained to gradually replace student affairs practitioners.
2. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )      As educational costs rise, institutional services, such as health services, psychological testing, child care centers, and student entertainment, will be placed on a pay-as-you-go, full cost, student option basis.
3. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )      The scope and degree of non-academic services provided students in all state controlled institutions will be mandated by legislative and governmental agencies.
4. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )      Student affairs practitioners, because of changing student demands, will primarily assume the role of ombudsman.
5. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )      The relationship of the student to the institution will eventually resemble that of citizen to "public utility" company; thus, many of the extra-curricular services offered by student affairs will be eliminated.
6. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )      Student affairs budgets will be substantially reduced due to declining enrollments, reduction of popular support for education, decreased tax support, and reduced federal allocation of categorical grants.

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

7. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Part-time staff in student affairs positions will increase, replacing full time staff.
8. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Student affairs will no longer be a separate entity but will be merged with central administration.
9. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Volunteer paraprofessionals will assume significant degrees of therapeutic and academic advising, career development, and student recruitment responsibilities.
10. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) A part of student activity fees will be increasingly utilized to support student unionization and lobbying activities.
11. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) As centralized administration and state bureaucracies assume greater control and develop more rigid regulations, student affairs will lose its flexibility in adapting to student needs.
12. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) As education becomes more of a contractual relationship between sellers of academic and non-academic services and the buyer, only those staff and services will survive for which the student will pay.
13. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Because student financial aid will continue to expand rapidly, financial and personnel resources in student affairs will have to be reassigned to meet this need.
14. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Student affairs practitioners will be required to coordinate with faculty in providing knowledge of job market needs in relationship to course content for an increasingly job oriented student population.
15. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Student affairs practitioners, in order to remain in the field, will need to become "scholarly-practitioners," with a theoretical and practical background in technical skills such as organization, planning, conflict resolution, budgeting, accountability systems, and economic marketing.
16. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Informational needs of students will be met through a student operated, student resource center, in a centralized location, replacing the many professional staff who now provide information today.

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

17. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) As student affairs staff increasingly become members of collective bargaining units the flexibility that student affairs needs to adapt to the changing needs of students will be reduced.
18. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Student affairs programs and staff will become increasingly dependent upon student activity fees as opposed to general institutional support or state revenues.
19. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Student affairs practitioners will only become involved with students in a secondary relationship, becoming facilitators and consultants, teaching students how to become peer group counselors and student activity organizers.
20. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Student affairs practitioners will be required to be accountable, with increasingly sophisticated and time consuming processes, to government agencies and students for not only the cost of programs but also the need and legitimacy of programs.
21. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) The increasingly predominant mature, married, part-time and/or commuter student will be less interested in activities and programs offered by student affairs.
22. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Occupation related counseling such as career and vocational guidance, national labor trends and occupational aptitude evaluation of individual students during each year of their four year education, will expand as one of the major functions of student affairs practitioners.
23. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) With continuing financial restraints, student affairs practitioners, designated on organizational charts as support personnel with no tenure rights, will gradually be eliminated.
24. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Accountability standards for student affairs programs and activities will be externally determined and evaluated by a state agency auditing staff.
25. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Increasingly, students will be more interested in vocationally oriented, credential-providing programs. Many students will shift to the wide range of non-college learning settings now available, reducing the need for campus student services.



(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

26. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Unions of students will be established to balance the power of faculty unions, carrying on their own negotiations with institutional officials or directly with trustees or the legislature.
27. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Campus life as a "community of students" will largely disappear as academic courses are increasingly taught in off-campus settings on nights, week-ends, or short-term block periods.
28. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Institutions will have decreasing control over non-academic sectors of student lives as education becomes more and more a consumer activity.
29. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Students will be trained to assume many of the non-professional counseling, informational, and special projects roles currently held by paid staff.
30. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Financial aid will expand and be transferred under the management of the institutional business office in a cooperative or joint arrangement with the admissions office.
31. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Student affairs staff with "specialist" roles will disappear to be replaced by ad-hoc administrator "generalists."
32. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) Students will demand a voting membership on all committees of the institution concerned with planning of courses and services, and the expenditure of monies for both.

## APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT STATEMENTS DETERMINED TO BE UNRELIABLE  
IN MEASUREMENT OF RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

TABLE 30

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: BECAUSE STUDENT FINANCIAL AID WILL CONTINUE TO EXPAND RAPIDLY, FINANCIAL AND PERSONNEL RESOURCES IN STUDENT AFFAIRS WILL HAVE TO BE REASSIGNED TO MEET THIS NEED

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	9	
(2) Moderately support	36	Mean all institutions: 2.57
(3) Neither support nor resist	11	Standard Deviation: 1.08
(4) Moderately resist	11	
(5) Strongly resist	4	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.44	2.88	2.61	2.15	2.40	2.83

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.614	0.512
Size	1	1.140	0.950
Permanency	1	0.000	0.000
Two-way interaction:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.084	0.773
Type X Permanency	1	0.906	0.345

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large and small institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 31

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS WILL BE REQUIRED TO COORDINATE WITH FACULTY IN PROVIDING KNOWLEDGE OF JOB MARKET NEEDS IN RELATIONSHIP TO COURSE CONTENT FOR AN INCREASINGLY JOB ORIENTED STUDENT POPULATION

<u>Instrument Values</u>		<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	16		
(2) Moderately support	39	Mean all institutions:	2.09
(3) Neither support nor resist	10	Standard Deviation:	0.88
(4) Moderately resist	5		
(5) Strongly resist	1		

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
1.94	2.63	2.28	2.31	1.40	2.00

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	1.012	1.443
Size	1	0.192	0.274
Permanency	1	0.341	0.486
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	6.983	9.955*
Type X Permanency	1	2.006	2.860

\*Significant at the .05 level

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, large and small institutions, or old and new institutions were accepted. However, in interaction between type and size, large universities were found more resistant.

TABLE 32

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS, IN ORDER TO REMAIN IN THE FIELD, WILL NEED TO BECOME "SCHOLARLY-PRACTITIONERS", WITH A THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL BACKGROUND IN TECHNICAL SKILLS SUCH AS ORGANIZATION, PLANNING, CONFLICT RESOLUTION, BUDGETING, ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS, AND ECONOMIC MARKETING

<u>Instrument Values</u>		<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support		19	
(2) Moderately support		29	Mean all institutions: 2.18
(3) Neither support nor resist		15	Standard Deviation: 0.99
(4) Moderately resist		7	
(5) Strongly resist		1	

<u>Category Means</u>					
<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.19	2.13	2.17	2.46	1.60	2.67

<u>Analysis of Variance</u>			
<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.220	0.228
Size	1	2.641	2.734
Permanency	1	2.369	2.453
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	1.732	1.814
Type X Permanency	1	2.349	2.432

### Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between small and large institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 33

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: THE INCREASINGLY PREDOMINANT MATURE, MARRIED, PART-TIME AND/OR COMMUTER STUDENT WILL BE LESS INTERESTED IN ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS OFFERED BY STUDENT AFFAIRS

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 70</u>	
(1) Strongly support	8	
(2) Moderately support	18	Mean all institutions: 2.83
(3) Neither support nor resist	23	Standard Deviation: 1.02
(4) Moderately resist	20	
(5) Strongly resist	1	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
2.88	3.13	3.06	2.77	2.33	2.50

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	2.743	2.610
Size	1	0.083	0.078
Permanency	1	0.085	0.081
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	1.253	1.190
Type X Permanency	1	0.122	0.116

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between small or large institutions, or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 34

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: OCCUPATION RELATED COUNSELING SUCH AS CAREER AND VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE, NATIONAL LABOR TRENDS AND OCCUPATIONAL ATTITUDE EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS DURING EACH YEAR OF THEIR FOUR YEAR EDUCATION, WILL EXPAND AS ONE OF THE MAJOR FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS PRACTITIONERS

Instrument Values	Responses all institutions = 71	
(1) Strongly support	26	
(2) Moderately support	32	Mean all institutions: 1.90
(3) Neither support nor resist	7	Standard Deviation: 0.89
(4) Moderately resist	6	
(5) Strongly resist	0	

#### Category Means

Universities			Community Colleges		
Small	Large		Small	Large	
New	New	Old	New	New	Old
1.94	2.63	2.11	1.62	1.40	1.67

#### Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	5.904	8.096*
Size	1	0.515	0.707
Permanency	1	0.163	0.223
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	2.237	3.068
Type X Permanency	1	1.362	1.868

\*Significant at the .05 level.

#### Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypothesis of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions was rejected. Universities were found more resistant than community colleges. The null hypothesis of resistance between small and large institutions or between old and new institutions were accepted.

TABLE 35

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES, CATEGORY MEANS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ON RESEARCH STATEMENT: INCREASINGLY, STUDENTS WILL BE MORE INTERESTED IN VOCATIONALLY ORIENTED, CREDENTIAL-PROVIDING PROGRAMS. MANY STUDENTS WILL SHIFT TO THE WIDE RANGE OF NON-COLLEGE LEARNING SETTINGS NOW AVAILABLE, REDUCING THE NEED FOR CAMPUS STUDENT SERVICES

<u>Instrument Values</u>	<u>Responses all institutions = 71</u>	
(1) Strongly support	2	
(2) Moderately support	11	Mean all institutions: 3.39
(3) Neither support nor resist	22	Standard Deviation: 0.96
(4) Moderately resist	29	
(5) Strongly resist	7	

Category Means

<u>Universities</u>			<u>Community Colleges</u>		
<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>		<u>Small</u>	<u>Large</u>	
<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Old</u>
3.19	3.38	3.61	3.69	3.30	2.83

Analysis of Variance

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Main effects:	3		
Type	1	0.003	0.003
Size	1	0.069	0.074
Permanency	1	0.061	0.066
Two-way interactions:	2		
Type X Size	1	0.922	0.995
Type X Permanency	1	1.104	1.191

Hypotheses Evaluation

The null hypotheses of no difference in resistance to future change between types of institutions, between large and small institutions, or between old or new institutions were accepted.



#### REFERENCE NOTES

1. Fauquet, T. W. A survey of non-traditional students at the University of Florida. Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Conference, Washington, D.C., March 19-23, 1978. Manuscript submitted for publication.
2. Sandeen, A, & Howell, J. Panel discussion, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Annual Meeting, Dallas, Texas, April 2, 1976.
3. Holzer, J. Consultant with Center for Instructional and Research Computing Activities, University of Florida, March 14, 1979.

## REFERENCE LIST

- Aaron, R. M. Student personnel workers in faculty collective bargaining. NASPA Journal, 1974, 12(2), 111-115.
- Abbott, M. G. Hierarchical impediments to administration. In F. D. Carver & T. J. Sergiovanni (Eds.), Organizations and human behavior: Focus on schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Alexander, K., & Solomon, E. S. College and university law. Charlottesville, Va.: Michie, 1972.
- American Council Committee on the Administration of Student Personnel Work. The administration of personnel programs in American colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1958.
- Atwood, M. S. Small scale administrative change: Resistance to introduction of a high school guidance program. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University Teachers College, 1964.
- Baldrige, J. V., & Deal, T. E. (Eds.). Managing change in educational organizations. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchau, 1975.
- Barzun, J. The American university. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Bender, L. W. Planning after the golden decade. In J. L. Wattenbarger & L. W. Bender (Eds.), Improving statewide planning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D., & Chin, R. (Eds.). The planning of change. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.
- Bevilacqua, J. P. The changing relationship between the university and the student: Implications for the classroom and student personnel work. College Student Personnel, 1976, 17(6), 489-494.
- Blaska, B., & Schmidt, M. R. Placement. In W. T. Packwood (Ed.), College student personnel services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.
- Blau, P. M. A formal theory of differentiation in organizations. American Sociological Review, 1970, 35(2), 201-218.
- Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. Formal organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

- Blocker, C. E. Student services--the future? In Clyde E. Blocker (Ed.), Humanizing student services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Bishop, J. B. Some guidelines for the development of accountability systems. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12(3), 190-194.
- Bogard, L. Management in institutions of higher education. In A. Wood and others, Papers on efficiency in higher education. Berkeley, Cal.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1972.
- Bonham, G. W. Consumer information and student choice. Change, May, 1977, pp. 10-11.
- Boyer, E. L. Rebuilding confidence. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.), The future in the making. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Boyer, E. L. Toward a new interdependence. In The Third Century. New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Brickman, W. W. Higher education in historical perspective. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November, 1972, pp. 31-43.
- Brunner, S. Viewpoint. Change, October, 1974, p. 55.
- Bucci, F. A. The crystal ball examined: A view of the future of student affairs. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Atlanta, Ga., April 3-6, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 130 501).
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The open-door colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. More than survival: Prospects for higher education in a period of uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Cartwright, D. Achieving change in people. Human Relations, 1951, 14(4), 381-392.
- Cheit, E. The new depression in higher education--two years later. In L. B. Mayhew (Ed.), The Carnegie Commission on higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Coe, A. C. The implications of collective bargaining for student and student personnel administrators. NASPA Journal, 1973, 11(2), 9-18.
- Corson, J. J. The governance of college and universities (Rev. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

- Costello, M. Academic tenure. Editorial Research Reports, 1974, 1(9), 163-169.
- Cowley, W. H. Some history and a venture in prophecy. In E. G. Williamson (Ed.), Trends in student personnel work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1949.
- Cowley, W. H. Reflections of a troublesome but hopeful Rip van Winkle. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1964, 6, 66-73.
- Crossland, F. E. Will the academy survive unionization? Change, February, 1976, pp. 38-42.
- Culver, C. M., & Hoban, G. J. (Eds.). The power to change. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Danells, M. Financial aid. In W. T. Packwood (Ed), College student personnel services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.
- Drake, R. W. Review of the literature for freshman orientation practices in the United States, 1966. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 030 920).
- Dresch, S. P. The crisis of the scholarly enterprise. In D. G. Trites (Ed.), Planning the future of the undergraduate college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Dressel, P. Measuring the benefits of student personnel work. Journal of Higher Education, January, 1973, pp. 24-26.
- Driscoll, J. Make way for tomorrows student. College Student Journal, Summer, 1977, pp. 132-124.
- Dugger, R. The community college comes of age. Change, February, 1976, pp. 32-37.
- El-Khawas, E. New expectations for fair practice. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1976.
- Enarson, H. L. Address delivered to the American Association of Higher Education. Chicago, Ill., March 11, 1974. Reprinted in Vital Speeches of the Day, April 15, 1974, pp. 396-398.
- Esman, M. J. Some issues in institution building theory. In D. W. Thomas, H. R. Potter, W. L. Miller, & A. F. Aveni (Eds.), Institution building: A model for applied social change. Cambridge: Schenkman, 1972.
- Eurich, A. C. The American campus in the 1980s. The Futurist, December, 1969, p. 150.

- Eurich, N. View from the year 2001. In R. W. Hostrop (Ed.), Education . . . beyond tomorrow. Homewood, Ill.: ETC Publications, 1975.
- Federal aid: Too many strings? Time, April 24, 1978, pp. 73-74.
- Folger, J. K. (Ed.). Increasing the public accountability of higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Fox, D. J. The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Freeman, R., & Holloman, J. H. The declining value of college going. Change, September, 1975, pp. 25-31.
- Fritz, A., Martin, D., & Sciame, J. The future of financial aid. College and University, 1976, 51(4), 755-757.
- Gallagher, B. Campus in crisis. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Gartner, A., Riessman, F., & Jackson, V. C. Paraprofessionals in education today. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1977.
- George, R. L., & George, K. A. Meeting the non-academic needs unique to the junior college student. NASPA Journal, 1971, 9(3), 155-159.
- Gibboney, R. A. The role of the state education department in educational change. In R. I. Miller (Ed.), Perspectives on educational change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Gilbert, F. (Ed.). 1979 Community, junior, and technical college directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.
- Gleazer, E. J., Jr. Positioning the community college. College Board Review, Spring, 1976, pp. 1-4.
- Glenny, L. A., & Kidder, J. R. Trends in state funding in higher education: A preliminary report. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, report no. 53, January, 1973.
- Goodlad, J. I. The dynamics of educational change: Toward responsive schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Gores, H. G. The American campus--1980. In A. C. Eurich (Ed.), Campus 1980. New York: Delacourte, 1968.
- Griffiths, D. E. Administrative theory and change in organizations. In F. D. Carver & T. J. Sergiovanni (Eds.), Organization and human behavior: Focus on schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

- Guba, E. In R. I. Miller (Ed.), Perspectives on educational change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Hage, J., & Aiken, M. Program change and organizational properties. American Journal of Sociology, 1967, 72, 509-519.
- Halstead, D. K. Statewide planning in higher education. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Harpel, R. L. Accountability: Current demands on student personnel programs. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12(2), 144-157.
- Harvey, T. R. Student development and the future of higher education: A force analysis. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1976, 17(2), 90-94.
- Hause, J. C. Ability and schooling as determinants of lifetime earnings. American Economic Review, 1971, 69, 289-298.
- Hefferlin, J. B. L. Dynamics of academic reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Hefferlin, J. B. L. Reform and resistance. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971, 4p. (Quote from Abstract of ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 053 686)
- Heist, P. Review and overview: Educational challenges for today and tomorrow. In P. Heist & J. R. Warren (Eds.), Responding to changing human resource needs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Henderson, A. D. The innovative spirit. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.
- Henderson, A. D., & Henderson, J. G. Higher education in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Henry, D. D. Challenges past, challenges present. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Hoenack, S. A. An evaluation of management techniques. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12(3), 195-201.
- Holmes, L. A history of the position of dean of women in a selected group of co-educational colleges and universities in the United States. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1939.
- Horn, F. H. Challenge and perspective in higher education. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971.

- Huberman, A. M. Understanding change in education: An introduction. Washington, D.C.: UNESCO, 1973.
- Huit, R. K. Autonomy on the line. In The Third Century. New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Humphries, J. W. Student personnel professions: Is there a future? Editorial Record, 1977, 58(1), 59-65.
- Hurst, J. C., & Ivey, A. E. Toward a radicalization of student personnel. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12(3), 165-168.
- Huse, E. F. Organization, development and change. St. Paul, Minn.: West, 1975.
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. The academic revolution. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.
- Johnson, R. Resistance: A precondition for change, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 027 898)
- Kemerer, F. R. United they stand: Growth of the student unions. Change, December, 1977, pp. 16-21.
- Kerr, C. Policy concern for the future. In D. Y. Vermilye (Ed.), Expanded campus: Current issues in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Kerr, C. Administration in an era of change and conflict. Educational Record, Winter, 1973, pp. 38-46.
- Kimball, J. Admission and financial aid--Ever the twain will meet? College and University, 1973, 48(4), 287-292.
- Knoell, D. M. Changing enrollment patterns--Changing functions. College Board Review, Spring, 1976, pp. 22-25.
- Kristol, I. A different way to restructure the university. New York Times Magazine, December 8, 1968, p. 50.
- Lewin, K. Field theory in social science. New York: Harper, 1951.
- Lloyd-Jones, E. Changing concepts of student personnel work. In E. Lloyd-Jones & M. R. Smith (Eds.), Student personnel work as deeper teaching. New York: Harper, 1954.
- Mann, F. C. Studying and creating change: A means to understanding social organization. Research in Industrial Human Relations, New York: Industrial Relations Research Association, Publication No. 17, 1957.

- Martorana, S. V., & Kuhns, E. Managing academic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Mayhew, L. B. Colleges today and tomorrow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Mayhew, L. B. (Ed.). The Carnegie Commission on higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Mayhew, L. B. Lessening influence and the search for purpose. In The Third Century, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- McGrath, E. J. Should students share the power? Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.
- McKee, J. E., Harris, C. M., Rhodes, P., & York, L. Paraprofessionals in the community college. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1977, 18(3), 231-234.
- Miles, M. B. (Ed.). Innovation in education. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1964.
- Miller, R. I. (Ed.). Perspectives on educational change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Miller, R. I. Directions in governance. In C. E. Blocker (Ed.), Humanizing student services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Miller, T. K. In W. T. Packwood (Ed.), College student personnel services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.
- Miller, T. K., & Prince, J. S. The future of student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Millett, J. D. Money and other trifles. In The Third Century. New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Minton, R. Matching students with money. Change, November, 1977, pp. 18-21.
- Mood, A. M. The future of higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- More people over 25 are going to college. Chronicle of Higher Education, April 10, 1978, p. 2.
- Morrish, I. Aspects of educational change. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Mueller, K. N. Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Mussano, F. A student operated resource center. NASPA Journal, 1976, 13(3), 47-51.



- National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education.  
Financing postsecondary education in the United States.  
 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
- Ness, F. W. Consensus and preservation. In The Third Century.  
 New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Newman, F. Taking the helm. In The Third Century. New York:  
 Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent  
 D. H. SPSS (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Nisbet, R. The future of tenure. Change, April, 1973, pp. 27-33.
- O'Banion, T., Thurston, A., & Gulden, J. Student personnel work:  
 An emerging model. Community and Junior College Journal,  
 1970, 41(3), 6-14.
- Olsen, J. K. Governance by confrontation: Adversarialism at the  
 University. Intellect, March, 1974, p. 364.
- Ostar, A. W. A confederacy of concerns. In The Third Century.  
 New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Packwood, W. T. (Ed.). College student personnel services.  
 Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.
- Parker, C. A. In W. T. Packwood (Ed.), College student personnel  
 services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.
- Part-time financial aid counselors in institutions of higher  
 education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of HEW and  
 NIE, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 146 875)
- Penny, J. F. Perspective and challenge in college personnel work.  
 Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.
- Perkins, C. D. The view from the hill. In The Third Century. New  
 York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Perkins, J. A. The university as an organization. New York: McGraw-  
 Hill, 1973.
- Peterson, M. W., Erwin, J. M., & Wilson, R. In J. K. Folzer (Ed.),  
Increasing the public accountability of higher education. San  
 Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Pfnister, A. O. Planning for higher education. Boulder, Colo.:  
 Westview, 1976.


- Pifer, A. A. A clash of tangled forces. In The Third Century. New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.
- Presthus, R. The organizational society. New York: Random House, 1965.
- Sanford, N. The college student of 1980. In A. C. Eurich (Ed.), Campus 1980. New York: Delacourte, 1968.
- Sapolsky, H. M. Organizational structure and innovation. Journal of Business, 1967, 40, 497-510.
- Sarason, S. B. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.
- Schneider, L. D. Junior college services. In W. T. Packwood (Ed.), College student personnel services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.
- Schwartz, E. The new university. In M. B. Bloy, Jr. & H. L. Hodgekinson (Eds.), Identity crisis in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Shark, A. R. The students' right to collective bargaining. Change, April, 1973, pp. 9-10; 62.
- Sieber, S. D. Organizational influences on innovative roles. In J. V. Baldridge & T. E. Deal (Eds.), Managing change in educational organizations. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchau, 1975.
- Simmons, C. E. P. An academic vice-president looks at student services/career services--A muddle. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Chicago, Ill., April 11-14, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 128 711)
- Solomon, C. Student to student counseling. Change, October, 1974, pp. 48-50.
- Stiles, L. J. Change in education. In G. Zaltman (Ed.), Phases and phenomena of social change. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Student consumer information services. The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 18, 1977, pp. 15-16.
- Trembley, E. L., & Sharf, R. J. Accountability strategies for student affairs. NASPA Journal, 1975, 12(4), 249-256.
- U. S. colleges life and death struggle. U.S. News & World Report, May 29, 1978, pp. 64-66.

- Vacarro, L. C. The future look of American education. Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1975, pp. 387-389.
- Watson, G. (Ed.). Concepts for social change. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1967.
- Watson, G. Resistance to change. In G. Zaltman (Ed), Processes and phenomena of social change. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Watson, J. E. Emerging trends in junior college student personnel work. Paper presented to the Second Annual Workshop of Junior College Student Personnel Specialists, Detroit, Michigan, April 7, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 021 255)
- Wattenbarger, J. L. Who now has the power? In J. L. Wattenbarger & L. W. Bender (Eds.), Improving statewide planning. San Franciaco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- When in doubt, "stop out". Time, May 22, 1968, p. 73.
- Williamson, E. G. Student personnel work in colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Willower, D. J. Barriers to change in educational organizations. Theory into Practice, 1963, 2, 257-263.
- Wise, M. Major developments to influence college students in the late '70s. NASPA Journal, 1976, 14(2), 2-12.
- Zaltman, G., Florio, D. H., & Sikorski, L. A. Dynamic educational change. New York: Free Press, 1977.
- Zander, A. Resistance to change--Its analysis and prevention. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne & R. Chin (Eds.), The planning of change (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.


## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Johanna C. White was born July 29, 1923, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and spent her early years residing in most of the large cities of the Eastern United States. She attended Cass Technical High School majoring in commercial art and fashion illustration, and one year at Michigan State University. After marriage and raising a family, during which she spent ten years in the fashion industry and lived in Florida, Arizona, and Guadalajara, Mexico, Mrs. White turned to furthering her education at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, graduating with a baccalaureate in psychology in 1965. She was employed for six years as master counselor for the Florida Industrial Commission in Miami, Florida. She attended Florida Atlantic University at Boca Raton, Florida, receiving a master of arts degree in counseling and guidance in 1968. She was executive director of a social service agency in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, for three and a half years prior to attending the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, in the department of educational administration.


I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
Arthur Sandeen, Chairman  
Professor of Educational Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
James L. Wattenbarger  
Professor of Educational Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

  
Harold C. Riker  
Professor of Counselor Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June 1979

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean, Graduate School